

35003
4

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXLVI.

JANUARY, 1894.

THE INCOME TAX ON CORPORATIONS.

BY THE HON. WILLIAM L. WILSON, CHAIRMAN OF THE WAYS
AND MEANS COMMITTEE.

THE Government of the United States is confronted with a present and growing deficit of revenues. The excess of income over expenditures for the year ending July 1, 1893, was only two million dollars. During the five months succeeding that date, receipts have fallen behind nearly thirty millions. An administration put into power by the people, with the express and unqualified commission to reduce the tax burdens, is pressed for means to meet the daily expenses of the public service. To falter in the great work of tariff reform would grievously disappoint the expectations of the people, and end the most inspiring contest in American politics with a ridiculous fiasco.

Were our system of federal taxation based upon enlightened economic principles, and our revenues gathered by any equitable rule of contribution, it would be an easy task to deal with any temporary shrinkage of income, due to the present commercial crisis, by the issuance of some form of government obligation or treasury certificates, to be taken up as soon as a return of business prosperity restored the normal volume of public revenue. But the very depression which to-day hardens the struggle for the necessities of life is in itself the strongest call for a readjustment of taxes, and the asphyxiation of production and trade

VOL. CLVIII.—NO. 446.

1

Copyright, 1893, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

within the confines of the home market demands that they should be given a larger freedom and a more abundant life. A Democratic administration, true to the traditions of the party, and following the precept and example of Mr. Jefferson, will earnestly attempt to substitute economy for taxation; but even when this has been done to the utmost limits that a judicious frugality will permit, it must still confront, as successfully as it can, the always unpopular duty of providing some new subject of taxation, not only to carry us through the existing crisis, but as a reliance for the few years during which our customs revenue may be lessened by the proposed reform of the tariff.

It is well to give a brief recital of the stages by which the federal treasury has been brought to its present straits and to put the responsibility where it justly and historically belongs. The surplus revenue for the year 1889 was estimated by Secretary Fairchild in his last report at \$104,000,000. It proved according to the first report of his successor, Mr. Windom, something over \$105,000,000. When the Cleveland administration went out of office on the 4th of March, 1889, it turned over an available cash balance which, if stated in the form of treasury statement used for the past two years, amounted to \$184,829,190.29. This included, of course, the gold reserve. During the four years of the Harrison administration the form of the public debt statement was twice changed, first by Mr. Windom to conceal the fatness, and later by Mr. Foster to conceal the leanness, of the treasury. Let us examine, now, how this splendid surplus with which it began housekeeping was scattered, and new methods of book-keeping became necessary to force any balance in its accounts.

The Democratic party had made an honest but unsuccessful attempt to relieve the treasury of surplus revenue by freeing the people of unneeded taxes. The full control of the government secured by the Republican party in the election of 1888 gave it an opportunity to deal with a treasury surplus according to genuine protectionist methods and ideas. Any tax that escapes into the public treasury without being tolled by some private tax-gatherer is an offence to those ideas. The protectionist lawmaker is ever seeking some device by which he can tap its current, and the more of it the better, into some private reservoir. Failing in this he will generally abolish it altogether. Such was the manner in which the McKinley bill dealt with the surplus reve-

nue. It discovered that tobacco had "come to be regarded as a necessity by the poor as well as the rich," and it proceeded to reduce internal revenue taxes on that prime and indispensable necessary of life, and to abolish the special taxes on dealers and manufacturers. Raw sugars were our chief revenue-producing article on the customs list, and so it wiped out the duties upon them, with the virtuous cry of "a free breakfast-table for the working-man." Both these taxes were in a just and proper sense revenue taxes. The tobacco tax should not have been touched, because it went directly into the treasury from the pocket of the taxpayer, and was burdensome upon no one. The sugar tax might very properly have been reduced, but should not have been entirely abolished, because of all the items in the tariff it carried the largest proportionate amount of what the people paid into the treasury, and the least proportionate amount as incidental protection to the home producer; and the direct bounty with which the McKinley bill replaced the incidental protection has been far more burdensome to the taxpayer. But while taxes on tobacco were remitted because it had become a necessity for the poor man, new and heavier taxes were laid on the woollen clothing indispensable to his health and his productive energy, and to the health and comfort of his family, taxes so merciless that I venture to say they have no parallel in the world to-day. While sugar was untaxed to give the American workman a free breakfast-table, new taxes were placed on his cups and saucers, his plates and dishes, his coffee-pot, his knives and forks, his canned food, his omelet, and his tablecloth. In a word he was relieved of part of the taxes he paid to his government, in order that he might be made to pay much greater and more oppressive taxes to the gentlemen who were graciously permitted to frame the McKinley bill.

Except for the release of these revenues, which in the interval since their release would have given us over \$150,000,000, we should not be confronted with a deficit to-day. The demands of the sinking fund for the past ten years could have been met, and there would yet be in the treasury a large balance, instead of less available cash of all kinds than the amount heretofore set apart as a special gold reserve to maintain the integrity of our paper money. But this does not tell the whole story. There was still the splendid surplus handed over by the previous administration, and accruing under the laws in force

up to the passage of the McKinley bill. How was that to be gotten out of the way? A large part of it was used to redeem, at a premium, bonds which had not yet fallen due. The purchase of such bonds, while effecting some saving to the government in future interest payments, depleted the treasury, so that it could not pay bonds which fell due a little later, and on which no premium could be demanded. Between the 4th of March and the 1st of October, 1889, Secretary Windom purchased \$66,954,551, paying for $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. bonds of 1891 premiums ranging from 5 to 8 per cent., and for 4 per cents due 1907 premiums ranging from 27 to 29 per cent. His report made December 1, 1890, showed that since June 30 of that year he had disbursed \$98,276,682.10, and had redeemed \$75,828,200 of bonds. The difference between these two sums was represented by \$12,000,000 prepaid interest and over \$10,000,000 premiums on bonds redeemed. The declared object of these prepayments was the necessity that large additional amounts should be at once returned to the channels of trade to avert threatened financial panic and disaster. But all this did not dissipate the surplus and the LIst Congress tried its hand upon it. It refunded the direct tax to the States, a mere log-rolling scheme to get at the treasury surplus, which Mr. Cleveland had vetoed when it was attempted in the previous Congress. This was a pure gratuity, but it took over \$14,000,000. Next came the sugar-bounty act, under which payments amounting to some \$170,000,000 have been made to sugar-growers. But chief of all as a means for emptying the treasury was the dependent pension act of June 27, 1890, the swelling disbursements under which have done so much to cause our present embarrassments. Under the operation of that law alone, our annual pension appropriation has risen more than \$60,000,000.

Such is the story of our depleted treasury, and the real purpose of all these gratuitous bestowals of public moneys, and these immense additions to our annual burdens, is not far to seek. They were but part of a general plan to fasten on the American people, in perpetuity, the harsh and gigantic scheme of private taxation embodied in the McKinley bill; no possible precaution against its reformation or repeal being omitted. I cannot help quoting and applying to our tariff policy the well-known words in which John Bright described the foreign policy of his own country, when he said that wars had been multiplied, taxes in-

creased, loans made, public expenditures augmented, in order that the great families of England enthroned in legislation "might have the first pull at it and the largest profit out of it."

"There is no actuary in existence," he declared, "who can calculate how much of the wealth, of the strength, of the supremacy of the territorial families of England has been derived from an unholy participation in the fruits of the industry of the people, which has been wrested from them by every device of taxation."

Is it to be wondered at that months before the close of Mr. Harrison's administration the treasury was in distress, and that, too, notwithstanding the large additional sum which the Sherman bill put at its disposal—a trust fund of over fifty-four million dollars, deposited by national banks to redeem their notes—and which had been used so fully that just before the present administration came into power over twenty-two millions were still due holders of banknotes. Nor need we wonder that Secretary Foster changed the form of treasury statement, and put to the credit of his cash assets some twenty millions of minor and subsidiary coin in June, 1891, or that the requirements of the sinking fund were only in part met in 1891, and not met at all in 1892 and 1893, except by counting payments for the redemption of banknotes—out of their own trust fund in reality—as payments towards the sinking fund, under another ruling, to which, if I mistake not, Mr. Foster was driven by the stress of circumstances. When to the more than \$200,000,000 used and made away with by the last administration, we add the loss of revenue from the two articles of sugar and tobacco alone, which amounts to more than 150 millions, it is not hard to understand why we have now an empty treasury, and how impossible it has been for Mr. Carlisle to maintain the gold reserve and yet meet the daily expenses of the government.

Such also are the supremely difficult conditions under which the Democratic party undertakes the duty of tariff reform. In attempting the great work which it has so eagerly sought permission to perform, it is brought to face an empty treasury and a permanent scale of colossal expenditures. It finds itself thus compelled not only to hold on to taxes it wishes to repeal or to reduce, but actually to seek out new sources of public revenue.

New taxes are always unpopular taxes, and no matter where we may turn for them we are sure to meet a chorus of vehement and angry protest. Especially has this been true as to the prop-

sitions to increase the internal tax on beer and to impose a moderate personal income tax. The theory of the income tax is a just theory, and has the approval of leading economical writers. Its trial in this country throws little light upon its practical operation, for it lived too short a time, and was too often changed to become a familiar and workable part of our fiscal system. Its early repeal was carried by a very narrow margin in both houses, which would not imply that it was specially unpopular. Senator Sherman was among these stoutly opposing this repeal. In a speech made in the Senate in May, 1870, he declared it "the most just and equitable tax that is now levied in the United States of America, without exception." Equally strong words of approval were spoken in the House by General Hawley, of Connecticut, and Mr. Kerr, of Indiana.

The place of the income tax in the English system has been stated by Mr. Noble, in his "National Finance," as follows :

"The enormous service which it has rendered in the liberation of trade from a multitude of onerous and oppressive burdens has been already referred to; its existence has rendered possible the great reform of our system of indirect taxation which has been the foundation of our modern commercial progress. It has the transcendent merit over duties of customs and excise, that it does not interfere with the processes of industry or the course of trade, and that the whole amount which it costs the taxpayer is devoted to the service of the state. It is, at present, almost the only impost by means of which any substantial contribution is levied from the increasing wealth of the country; and its repeal without any effective substitute would aggravate the pressure of taxation upon those classes which are least able to bear the burden. It has its inequalities, but they are by no means so flagrant and unjust as the inequalities of indirect taxation."

But despite these strong arguments in favor of an individual income tax, and the unquestionable equity of its general theory, there are very grave counter-reasons which rise up before a legislature who seeks to embody it into our federal tax system. Aside from the very natural objection of those who might have to pay such a tax, its administration is necessarily accompanied by some exasperating and some demoralizing incidents. Our people have so long and so generally been free from any public scrutiny into their personal incomes, and even from any personal contact with federal tax collectors, that they resent the approach of either. Moreover, like the personal property tax, which is so universally evaded, a personal income tax would easily lend itself to fraud, concealment, and perjury, and prove, as Mr. Mill said, a

tax upon conscience. And finally, in a country of the large geographical dimensions of the United States, it would be difficult to put into smooth and effective working order the necessary machinery for its thorough collection.

It is not, in my judgment, however, liable to the charge that it is class taxation. Taxes upon consumption are taxes upon the poor, and it is one of the capital enormities of our present tariff laws that they place the chief burden of supporting the federal government and of paying pensions upon the labor of the country. The balance of taxation ought to be weighted by some taxes drawn from the property of the country. But there is one class of our citizens who own and control a very large and increasing part of the property of the country; who enjoy certain public franchises of a very substantial character, and who therefore have no right to object to some public scrutiny of their incomes. A small tax imposed upon the incomes or earnings of corporations, while not burdensome in any individual case, and not often bearing sensibly upon the interest of any private shareholder in them, would produce a revenue sufficient to cover a large part of the gap now opening between receipts and expenditures. Such a tax would not be a tax upon individual thrift, energy, or enterprise, but in the main upon the earnings of invested capital; and in view of the exemption from personal liability of stockholders, and other privileges which corporations enjoy, but which the individual business or professional man cannot enjoy, the equity of a tax upon their net earnings seems the more apparent, while the ascertainment of those earnings would generally be easy and reasonably accurate, and free from the offensive inquisition so much declaimed against in the case of the individual. The very limited public supervision incident to the assessment and collection of such a tax would not work any wrong or any interference with their lawful operations, while as a necessary part of a tax law, and used only for that *bona-fide* purpose, it might be salutary in its influence. Such are some of the reasons which, as I write, are impelling some members of the Ways and Means Committee to favor resort to a small tax on the earnings of corporations. Should, however, the final action of that committee on internal revenue matters not contain such a provision, it must not be taken as at all inconsistent with what I now say.

WILLIAM L. WILSON.

REPUBLICANISM IN BRAZIL.

BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE BRAZILIAN MINISTER AT WASHINGTON,
SALVADOR DE MENDONÇA.

WHEN, on the 15th of November, 1889, the telegraph announced to the world that a republic had been proclaimed in Brazil, "in the empire of good old Dom Pedro," the astonishment was general. It was like a thunderbolt from a cloudless sky. The opinion was universal that the Brazilian nation, which, on the 22d of September, 1822, had received its independence from the hand of Dom Pedro I., and two years later its constitution, was enjoying, after sixty-five years of parliamentary government under a monarchy, an enviable prosperity. There was a vague knowledge, it is true, that the first emperor of Brazil had been forced to abdicate in 1831 by a forcible expression of the popular will; but the idea generally entertained of Pedro II., based on his really lofty moral qualities, but propagated and exaggerated by those whose interested admiration was given rather to the monarch than to the man, had surrounded his name and his reign with an aureole so brilliant that the whole world regarded as indisputable the excellence of the monarchical government of Brazil.

To such as were intimately acquainted with the internal condition of the empire, the absorption of all the constitutional powers by the crown, the farcical character of the electoral system which indorsed every act of the monarch, the intensified centralization which was stifling the provinces of the empire in the political embrace of the court, the atrophy and decay of the several members of the body politic, out of reach of the vitality of the centre, the constant deficits in the budget covered by the chronic abuse of national loans,—to those, above all, who knew that the heiress to the throne prided herself on her resemblance to her grandfather, the impetuous, irritable, tyrannous Pedro I., rather than

to her father, whose good-nature was only equalled by his political incapacity—the wife of a prince of the Orleans family, remarkable only for his avarice and his ignorance of the art of government,—to such the imperial legend did not inspire the same confidence in the future of the Brazilian nation.

The doubts that hovered over the third reign grew thicker as the infirmity of the aged Emperor increased, in the period beginning in 1887. He was constitutionally incapacitated for the exercise of the functions of his high office. After his return from Europe, in 1888, his attendant physician, Dr. Motta Maia, was employed near him in the discharge of duties not provided for in the constitution. He acted as a sort of chancellor, arranged the audiences given by the Emperor to his ministers, who no longer met in council with the chief of the nation, and the latter dispatched the business of each portfolio as far as permitted by his watchful attendant, and as well as his enfeebled faculties would allow.

At that time, full of apprehension even for those who were interested in the maintenance of the monarchy, and while the Joam Alfredo cabinet was still in power, a combination of the partisans of the empire in the Liberal and Conservative parties was suggested, whereby the Emperor should be declared physically incapacitated to reign. At that time, however, the palace of the imperial princess in the little city of Petropolis was the scene of chicanery and conflicting intrigues, and the future chief of the ministry, the Viscount of Ouro Preto, was already sure of succeeding Joam Alfredo, supported by the zeal of two friends in the princess' household, and it was thought more prudent to make haste slowly and to gather the fruits of the inauguration of the third reign under the direction of the Liberal party, rather than share them with political adversaries. It was by this arrangement alone that the old monarch was spared the fate of another King Lear.

The history of the Brazilian monarchy, as well as that of the evolution of republican opinion in Brazil, are yet to be written, particularly in its relation to the strife which in that part of the American continent was carried on for a century between monarchical and democratic principles.

The present writer disturbed and full of anxiety at this moment in which a crisis is approaching in the combat which must

end sooner or later in victory for the republic, and while the friends of free institutions on this continent are waiting more or less anxiously for the result, does not propose to write that history. Nevertheless, it does not appear inopportune to delineate briefly the general features of that struggle begun in the colonial period and continued to this day.

Republicanism in Brazil has its heroes and its martyrs worthy of historic mention when the annals shall be written of that nation to which was apportioned a territory as vast as that of the great North American Union, and which in the next century is destined to play in South America the same part as that which in this century and in this portion of the continent has been taken by the United States.

Even before the French invasion of the Liberian peninsula had, in 1808, forced the royal family of Portugal to take refuge in Brazil, already in the free mountains of Minas the seed scattered to all the winds by the movement for independence in North America had germinated.

In an almost forgotten page of the diplomatic correspondence of this country, one of the founders of the great American Union refers to that fact in language which under the present circumstances it is pleasant to recall. Thomas Jefferson, writing to John Jay from Marseilles on May 4, 1787, alludes to an interview which he had recently had in Nismes with a young Brazilian student who had come to consult him in regard to a proposed republican movement in Brazil. The young man had represented to him that many enlightened and patriotic men in his country were eager to follow the example of the United States and rid themselves of the oppressive yoke of the mother-country. The difficulties in the way of such an attempt would be almost insuperable unless they were supported by some friendly nation, and for such support they naturally turned to the great American republic.

The movement in Minas, although without the aid of the most enlightened men of Rio de Janeiro and the north, had at its head a band of magistrates, men of letters and patriots, among whom were Colonel Alvarenga Peixoto, Judge Thomas Antonio Gonzaga, the lawyer Claudio Manoel Dacosta, poets all three, whose writings were the beginning of our national literature, and Silva Xavier, commonly known as Tiradentes.

Betrayed and denounced to the Portuguese governor, they were arrested, tried, and convicted. Claudio Manoel was strangled in prison for fear that the eloquence of his defence would light the flames of independence in the hearts of the oppressed people; Gonzaga was banished to Africa and ended his days in exile; Maria I. of Portugal commuted the death penalty in the case of Alvarenga Peixoto and sixteen of his companions, whose banishment for life was considered as an act of royal mercy; but the rigors of the law were visited on Tiradentes, who was hanged in Rio de Janeiro. His body was quartered and his members distributed among various cities of the interior, his house was razed to the ground and its site sown with salt, while his descendants were declared infamous forever.

The impression left upon the people by the martyrdom of these patriots had not yet been effaced when the royal family of Braganza, flying from Lisbon, arrived at Rio de Janeiro. The head of the family was the prince regent Dom Joam, afterward Joam VI. of Portugal, a cowardly prince, whose chief claim to distinction was the number of roast chickens he ate daily, while leaving the direction of political affairs to his wife, the princess Carlotta, a Spaniard by birth, who at once involved Brazil in political intrigues on the Rio de la Plata.

Between his stupid father and ambitious mother grew up the prince Dom Pedro, badly educated, licentious, and ambitious for power. This royal trio came to plant in America the principles of absolute monarchy which the storm of the French Revolution had swept from Europe. For the growth of such a plant the climate of America could not be propitious, and but few years had passed when the first note of resistance was sounded in the north of Brazil.

Republican revolutions broke out in Pernambuco in 1817 and in 1821, in Bahia in the latter year, and in the states of the north in 1824. The last-named revolt took the name of the "Confederation of the Equator."

Although these attempts at republican independence ended in disaster, they were evidence of the spirit of freedom that existed in Brazil; and the names of those who took part in them, of Domingos Martins, the priests Roma and Caneca of Ratcliff, and Carvalho, all victims of the monarchy, have never been forgotten by the people.

The patriots of Sao Paulo, Minas, and Rio, after the return of Joam VI. to Portugal, encouraged the ambition of Prince Dom Pedro, and by offering him the empire brought about the independence of the country in 1822. They had secured from the prince the promise of a representative government under a constitution ; but when the constitutional convention elected for that purpose had framed a constitution, it was dissolved by force of arms, and the assembly was dispersed under the menace of a park of artillery posted in front of the building where it was sitting.

Instead of a constitution adopted by the representatives of the people, Brazil was given one dictated by the prince, into which was introduced the so-called moderative power belonging exclusively to the crown, and which effectually overshadowed all the other powers of the charter.

Pedro I. governed Brazil with the same whip with which he drove his carriage horses, and whose lash was more than once felt by the press. His complaints in the circle of his favorites against the radical press instigated the assassination of Libero Badaro in Sao Paulo.

In the desire of securing the election of his minister Maia by the vote of the people already estranged from him, he made a visit to the State of Minas, where, instead of the rejoicing with which he had been received in the interior at the proclamation of independence, he met with a cold reception from a tax-burthened people who had lost their illusions, and listened to masses of requiem chanted for the murdered republican journalist.

Returning to Rio de Janeiro he was forced by the people of the capital assembled in the public square to remove from his head the imperial crown on the 7th of April, 1831. The exotic monarchical plant appeared to have reached the end of its brief existence, but the leaders of the revolutionary movement, or at least the most influential of them, as Vergueiro and Evaristo da Veiga, advised the continuance of the existing form of government.

The son of the deposed emperor was not yet six years old ; a tutor was appointed for him, and a regency established which lasted ten years, and under which the scope of constitutional liberty was considerably broadened while the evolution of the republican idea still went on. Some time after, during the reign of Pedro II., when the ex-Regent Feijó engaged in the revolution of Sao Paulo, crushed as well as that of Minas by General Caxias,

he declared with bitterness that the error of the Brazilians had been in warming in their bosom the viper of monarchy whose victims they had become.

The reign of Pedro II., which began in 1841, is divided into three distinct periods : the first is that of his apprenticeship in the art of government under the influence of those who were charged with his tuition, of whom one was a bishop and the other a courtesan ; the second is that of the conservative predominance characterized by the reaction against the liberal advances of the regency ; and the third is that of a pseudo-philosophy in which the monarch attempted to compensate for the public liberties more or less suppressed, by improved material conditions.

The writer of this article, who was personally well acquainted with the second emperor, and who knows by experience that the liberty of the press, at least, was respected under his reign, will be the last to refuse to do him justice.

As the period of the regency has bequeathed to Brazilian history the names of Feijó and Bernardo de Vasconcellos, so the reign of Pedro II. has furnished those of illustrious Brazilians, who, under the very monarchy, have materially advanced the cause of liberty.

Not to lengthen too much the historic roll, it will be enough to mention here Eusebio de Queiroz, the typical constitutional minister ; Carneiro Leam, the advocate of the policy of conciliation, which ended the ostracism of the liberal party ; Rio Branco, the originator of the legislative movement for the abolition of slavery, and José Antonio Saraiva, who gave Brazil the electoral law the sincere execution of which would be sufficient to lead to a republican form of government.

Indeed, in all the long reign of Pedro II. there are only three things in his political conduct which reach the altitude of his moral stature—the liberty of the press, the abolition of slavery and the disinterested patriotism which in the last days of the government inspired the aged emperor, as was shown by his willingness to abdicate in favor of the republic.

This consent to abdicate, unique of its kind, deserves more particular mention, since it offers an opportunity for throwing light upon the present political situation in Brazil.

In 1869 certain men of undoubted political sincerity who had lost faith in the programme of the liberal party, which, while in

opposition identified itself with the most radical and extreme opinions, and when called to power became the subservient instruments of the personal power of the crown, abandoned their former leaders, and through the press and clubs took up again the advocacy of republican principles. From the publication of the manifesto of the new party to the proclamation of the republic, on the 15th of November, 1889, the republican cause gained ground rapidly. Men like Saldanha Marinho, Quintino Bocayuva, Aristides Lobo, Felicio dos Santos, Campos Salles, Prudente de Moraes, Assis Brazil, Americo Lobo, Rangel Pestana, Lucio de Mendonca, Demetrio Ribeiro, Paes de Carvalho, Martins, junior, Alexandre Stockler, Silva Jardim and Lopes Trovam, in the press, in the parliament and in public meetings for twenty years fearlessly defended their principles.

These apostles of the republican doctrine demanded the amendment of the monarchical constitution in the ways provided for by that document ; they desired the advent of the republic by means of victory gained at the polls—in a word, they aimed at the establishment of the republic in and by the parliament.

In May, 1889, the Joam Alfredo cabinet was overthrown, and when the Viscount of Ouro Preto had already reached an understanding with the imperial princes in regard to the twofold succession of the cabinet and the throne, the old emperor unaware of this arrangement, sent for the statesman Saraiva, the most loyal of the prime ministers of his reign.

Saraiva, with the clearness of perception that characterized this statesman, saw that the republic was inevitable and close at hand, and was afraid that it would come accompanied by civil war. Answering the summons of the Emperor, he advised him to make terms with the cause that was destined to triumph. He told him that his prime minister should offer in the Parliament plans of reform so radical that the transition from monarchy to republic could be effected without a shock. This could be done by means of a federation of the provinces with governments having largely increased powers. The Emperor accepted the advice of the old statesman, invited him to carry this policy into effect, and made ready in this way to surrender his power into the hands of popular sovereignty.

Saraiva refused to accept this charge ; for he knew that Ouro Preto had already determined upon another plan, and that he

could not depend upon the support of the majority of his own party.

So instead of Saraiva, Ouro Preto became chief of the cabinet, and the Brazilian monarchy, instead of bequeathing to history a fair page of disinterested patriotism on which the person of Pedro II. would have figured at the head of all monarchs, it left that in which are recorded the thanks of Count d'Eu to the provisional government for the settlement of the imperial succession for the sum of two and a half millions of dollars.

In its haste to carry into effect the original purposes of its programme the historical republican party allied itself with the military class, and, supported by it, unexpectedly proclaimed the republic. The enterprise was not difficult, for the empire had not a single defender left. Was it wisely or unwisely done? The answer is not easy to give. In the very Parliament elected under the Ouro Preto ministry, Saraiva could have easily obtained the predominance and carried out his plan for a federation of the provinces, and the following legislature would have with the same ease voted for the establishment of the republic. Such would doubtless have been the dictate of prudence; as in that case the new institutions would be the natural outgrowth of the representative system. But what is done cannot be undone. If the step was taken hastily, it was at least in the right direction.

The chief danger would be in looking backwards. The revolution has given to Brazil republican institutions which must be defended at all hazards, leaving whatever defects they may have to be remedied by wisdom after the safety of those institutions has been assured.

Were the republic as bad as its worst enemies paint it, it would still be preferable to any monarchy that could be set up on its ruins. No restoration, however, is now possible in Brazil.

The efforts to effect it would undoubtedly excite a civil war whose bitterness would be intense and duration indefinite, but whose result no republican can doubt.

SALVADOR DE MENDONÇA.

AFTER-THOUGHTS OF A STORY-TELLER.

BY GEORGE W. CABLE.

THE author of a few novels not among the "hundred most popular" drops his pencil upon his tablet in the joy of having finished another. To him this is achievement, and triumph and rest are as sweet to the feeble as to the strong. Finished, he says. A score or two of magazine pages have yet to be written, and he feels he must write them while he is still vibrating to the key of the story's chords; but to-morrow will serve for this beginning of the end, since he has now only to elaborate what is fully planned, to consummate what fate—or art, the two are one—has at last clearly ordained. Such a moment tempts the story-maker to reminiscence and makes the how-do-you-do-it of a reader almost as flattering as the how-do-you-do of a princess—or publisher. Yet it is not proposed here to tell how novelists go about their work or, indeed, to enter into heavy explanation of anything.

The first impulse toward the production of a novel—does it have to be inspiration? I think not. If it be inspiration—whatever that is—it is more apt to be an inspiration of the will than of the constructive imagination. The word of the muse may come unto me saying, Write; but it will probably never say more until I sit down in the spirit of a toiler, saying, What shall I write? I know one writer who even for a short story has sat for weeks in feline patience and tension at the mouse-hole of his constructive powers, knowing only that the inspiration was in there and had got to come out. Inspiration does sometimes come with *almost* inexplicable spontaneity; but if it does not come with hard hammering of the brain, it comes after it; never before, so far as this writer knows.

The primary impulse toward my first sustained novel was an

ambition kindled by the unexpected invitation of a magazine's editors. The next was the good-morning word of a sanguine friend. I can still hear him calling down the stairway from the door of his office: "Begin it! Never mind how it's to come out; you have abundant invention; trust to that." And, if I remember aright, the story was written without a single preliminary memorandum of its scheme.

Yet I had a scheme clearly in mind; a scheme in which one of the first things decided was how the tale should end. For the rest it consisted mainly in a choice and correlation of the characters I designed to put upon my stage. The plot was not laboriously planned. It was to be little more than the very old and familiar one of a feud between two families, the course of true love fretting its way through, and the titles of hero and heroine open to competition between a man and his friend for the one and a mother and daughter for the other. Upon this well-used skeleton I essayed to put the flesh and blood, the form and bloom, of personalities new to the world of fiction. To do this and to contrive a plausible variety of scenes and incidents that should secure to these children of the fancy the smiling acquaintance of the reading world, were far more than a sufficient tax on the supposed redundancy of my powers of invention. That fountain never overflowed. It dribbled steadily, and from then till now it has rarely done more. To-morrow, always to-morrow, it will; surely it will! But it never does.

If slowness only meant excellence! Speed is bad, yes; the best tales are not by the swiftest writers; and yet the product of nearly all the best story-writers has been abundant. Forgive the sigh—but I have never heard of any story-producing pen so slow as the one here writing. The novel it is just completing stands for nearly eighteen months of work and was begun three years ago. Perhaps it is as well for everybody that not all the novelists are "abundant in invention." Those who write five or six hundred ten-word lines per day when they write, surely must spend long periods without writing at all. If I could write two hundred lines a day I should write four novels a year!

Death early took from me the generous prompter of my stimulating delusion. It is very pleasant, this opportunity to speak of him with sincere gratitude. He helped me to make a very valuable mistake. To be emboldened by his compliments

was easy, for he was a distinguished physician, of high literary attainments, and had been the friend of Pinckney, Timrod, and William Gilmore Sims. I never put more than a hint or two of him into any fictional character, but his partner, a man of more picturesque idiosyncracies, became Doctor Sevier.

I wrote occasional short stories for three years before essaying a twelve-months serial, and they were a good stepping-stone. Yet sometimes now they bother me. While I may be writing a novel the best way I know how, some pertinent, or even impertinent, short story will haunt my elbow, saying, "Put me in, too." But I know better. "I have study that out," as the model for Narcisse really used to say. Somebody awhile ago started the notion that it is as difficult and creditable to write a short story as a sustained novel. Oh, my ! Is a little boat as hard to build as a big ship ? Is a melody as great a musical achievement as a symphony ? One does not quite prove or disprove his talent for the long story by succeeding or failing with the short one ; and still, until he has given the short one a thorough trial, he had better let the long one alone. But literary beginners show an inordinate tendency to attack the long story first. However, better that than to let a short story into a long one. It is almost sure to prove a parasite.

Whether a long story has ever embraced one, and only one, short story without some damage, I have not read enough to know, but only to doubt. The question is, possibly, more curious than important. A single long story made of several short ones is perfectly practicable, but is it ever its author's best ? Not often, I think. I tried this in *Bonaventure*. The pastoral nature of the subject favored the scheme, and I am not sure that I need regret the outcome. But once is enough, and the novel I am now finishing has at least this claim on my hopes : that it is one story, and only one.

In *The Grandissimes*—three syllables, yes, not four—there is a short story, to and around which the whole larger work is built. It is the episode of Bras-Coupé, which was written much as it stands before the novel was begun. I do not know that any one has ever resented this piece of incorporation, yet I mention it to disclaim all present approval of such methods. The only method I know by experience to be worse is the expanding of a *true* story into a novel, which I did in *Doctor Sevier*. Fact and fiction are

twin handmaidens of truth, but the man who takes them both to wife at once will not get the best of either. I have not done it since, and shall never do it again. But how easy and pleasant are contrition and confession when one has no further use for his sin !

Certain authors are often congratulated upon their having "discovered a new field." The congratulators really mean not a field in which no one, or dozen, have tried to write before, but only a field in which no one before has reaped large success. Truth is, the only discovery worth making in this direction is not a new field of romance with geographical or chronological boundaries, but the fact that the field of romance is wherever man is, and its day every day ; that wherever in place or time there is room—and where in the habitable earth is there not?—for wars of the heart against environment, circumstance, and its own treasons, there is the story-teller's field ; and though old as Nineveh or as hard trodden as Paris, it will be, to his readers, just as fresh or stale, as small or great, as his individual genius, and no more. He may draw attention for a while to his new field of time and place ; but if that is all, or the most of him and his work, his literary remains will not live. They will barely fossilize.

The plot of the novel I am just completing is, I believe, more my own than any I have before put into a sustained work ; but its field, as to time and place, though both early and lately familiar to me, is not mine by any right of first discovery or occupancy. Possibly the work may prove all the worse for this. If so, I have made my own bed and must lie on it, and if I perish, I perish. Why not? A writer, as a writer, cannot die till his time comes ; and if it ought to come soon, where is the gain in filibustering for postponements? Least of all ought any "field" to save him, except the field of his own inner gifts.

We have spoken of a novel whose end is in sight, scarcely fifty pages away, as though the rest of the journey were easy. It is, and it isn't. For as the writer looks forward to the final conflict of passions, endeavors, and destinies to which his complicated correlation of imagined lives and loves has brought him, he knows that he has got to suffer and enjoy it all—all ! before he can so produce it on the page that what he writes shall stay written. Great is sentiment. For sentiment is but good Latin for feeling, and feeling is living. But despicable is sentimentality, which, even when

it is not a conscious lie, is at best but a feeling after feeling. If only—to mention an extreme case—if only the average reporter would perceive this and cease to load his columns with periods which, because unfelt by himself, suffocate the emotions he seeks to arouse! No author, from whatever heaven, earth, or hell of actual environment he may write, can produce a living narrative of motives, passions, and fates without having first felt the most of it, and apprehended it all, in that invisible life which every man and woman, in degree, lives in and by the imagination.

Of course, the story-teller may find and use living models and will be grateful whenever fortune brings them to him; but when she does not, he has the memory of countless disembodied traits and whims, and, better still, he has himself. For let him find ever so complete a model, he can never make that model live again on the page of fiction by merely reporting him or her. He cannot, successfully, paste photographs into a novel. Whatever richness or sterility, baseness, beauty, or grotesqueness, of mind or soul, the exigencies of his story require him to portray, he is likely—he is bound—to find somewhere in himself, at last, his own best model; and as he lays down his pen at the conclusion of a long story he is forced to confess in his heart, “My name is Legion, for we are many.”

Models are good; notebooks are advantageous. I only say, out of my not too extensive experience, that the model within the author, and it only, is indispensable. As for notebooks, *Bonaventure* is my only fiction in which a well-filled notebook proved of any direct service. Some artists make sketches and then tear them up. What they cannot thereafter forget is all they need to remember. I fancy this is the only way I shall ever again be able to make a notebook useful. It is not sight the story-teller needs, but second sight. We do not need to have seen everything in order to feel it, but we do need to feel whatever we would have a reader see. My “Posson Jone” (Parson Jones) is made entirely without a model, while his friend Jules St. Ange is made from two, one for his moral theories and one for his sunny presence. In *Madame Delphine*, only her daughter, not she, nor Père Jerome nor any other character, is drawn with reference to a living model. In *Bonaventure* the hero and Tarbox are portraits—not photographs, I hope,—while the curé of Caranero, made with no model either in sight or memory, turned out to be a surprising

likeness, in person, traits, and life, of a parish priest laboring within fifteen miles of the place, whom I have had the honor to meet, but whom I had never seen or heard of till after the story was printed. It was the Bonaventure of actual life, not of the novel, who cried to me :

“Some people say that Victor Hugo is an in-fiddle. Oh, sir, sir!—he—he perspires rheligion!”

And it was he, the actual, who, when told by Mr. Kemble, the illustrator, that he had been put into a book as an unmarried man, exclaimed in distress : “Sir, it must not be, for I am the fatheh of six chil’run !”

In *The Grandissimes* every prominent character is drawn from a model—including Frowenfeld—except Clotilde, who, I think, any reader will say, is both more real and more attractive than the apothecary. Aurore’s model was at least as beautiful and charming as she is portrayed, and in the same ways. I was once her next-door neighbor. A very ugly old line fence between us had either to be repaired or replaced, and I suggested a low, invisible lawn fence. She sweetly bade me suit my caprice entirely ; but the new fence was hardly in place before she erected, close against it, another, of feather-edged, hard pine boards, seven feet high.

In *Doctor Sevier*, Narcisse is partly from a model ; closely as to his graces, beauty, and philosophy ; but as to his moral shortcomings and sinuosities he is drawn from—ahem !—the author himself. Until he wrote the novel whose last number is still in his hands, the writer has never tried to portray a life-sized villain ; maybe he has not yet done so ; but he has never thus far drawn upon his own inner consciousness for a scamp and had his check dishonored. There’s something to be proud of !

For the man who holds their confirmation within himself models never spoil ; they keep like mummies. Mrs. March, in my new novel, is mainly the restoration of a person whom I have scarcely seen for twenty years. Of what use are models outside one’s self, to a writer who cannot do without them ? You—the reader—you do without them. You say Shakspeare depicts remorse with amazing trueness. How do you know ? You never had remorse. And yet you do know. You know remorse by sight the moment he shows it to you, because when he holds the mirror up to nature he holds it up to your nature ; you can

waive experience. If you could know remorse without having to be shown it by either Shakspeare or experience—could feel it without having felt it—you would be Shakspeare, in degree ; as, in point of fact, you and all of us are, or even Shakspeare would have no readers. This is the way, if not the only way, in which it is true, as Mr. Drake has just said in his beautiful story of *The Yellow Globe*, that “only a man with a haunted heart can paint a haunted house.” Not actual experience, not actual observation, but the haunted heart ; that is what makes the true artist, of every sort. Now and then it even makes a critic.

On the other hand, the story-teller finds that what he reveals of himself comes not from that which is himself alone, but which is only, and recognizably, so many phases of the universal self. These he clothes in any idiosyncracies, whether of self or of others, which, as a cunning costumer, he finds will so drape them in the garments of individuality as not to conceal, but exaltedly to adorn, emphasize, and reveal, the humanity within. The artistic necessity that he should be wholly free to do this is what so often makes the marriage of fiction to biography an unhappy match. It is only in its eclectic use of the idiosyncratic that fiction needs to be fiction at all. In its presentments of the universal self it is as firmly bound by art as history is by morals, to be true to the very white of truth. Seest thou a man free in the one realm and faithful in the other ? He shall stand before kings ; he shall not stand before Sunday-school library committees.

These drafts of his art upon his own inner experience teach the novelist to see and reverence the romance and majesty, comedy and tragedy, of all the human life about him, through its numberless disguises of culture, of unculture, or of commonplace. For he soon discovers this odd yet most natural thing, that in drawing from those inexhaustible springs of the universal heart he will sometimes think the ascending bucket on the wheel is his own heart and find it is another's, or think it is another's and lo ! it is his own. We never know what we can do till we try, they say. Add this : Neither we nor our story-writing friend can half know what we are till he has put us into a story ; when, by virtue of his very fiction about us—his grotesque exaggeration of our idiosyncracies—we stand revealed. How many a true gentleman never suspected there was a whole Bartley Hubbard hid away in him until Howells nailed that fellow's ear to the public

whipping-post ! That good physician who, out of his own experience, told me the story of *Doctor Sevier*, never noticed that he was the true hero of it, nor did I, until I had begun to write it. True heroism does not see itself, any more than a good eye does ; nor does even our oculist notice what a good eye we have until he throws an extravagant light into it and searches it with a terrible goggle on his own. I never knew two such persons as old Manouvrier and his wife to have any such experience as that which makes my late short story, *The Taxidermist*. Nor did I remember that I had ever known two such characters at all, until a married pair—old friends—sent me their kind commendations, whereupon I instantly recognized in them the models whose spiritual likenesses I had unconsciously painted. Had they not spoken I might never have suspected them. They will never suspect themselves.

The larger work, whose end lies just before me in its first completeness, is full of model-drawn characters. It is time I turned back to it from this road to nowhere. What it is to be when it is too late to mend it, the writer cares, of course, immeasurably more than the reader. I wish I knew. But what I wish it were is this : A pleasing story of the heroic in imagined lives ; truth of the passions and affections, not advocated, but portrayed ; a book with every page good prose, and each of its chapters, as a chapter, good poetry ; a book able to keep you—not me, merely—always emotionally interested, and leave you profited ; a story written for all readers, to all, and at none. I should call that a good novel, but alas !—

G. W. CABLE.

ARE THE SILVER STATES RUINED?

BY THE HON. DAVIS H. WAITE, GOVERNOR OF COLORADO.

As a result of the financial policy of the government since 1873, culminating in the repeal by Congress in October last of the Sherman Act, the prosperity of the silver producing States has been greatly injured—so much, that the inquiry is sometimes made, Does that injury amount to ruin?

Colorado is not ruined. With its vast area of 275 miles by 380 miles, our State possesses every variety of soil and climate which belong to the temperate zone. The valleys along our rivers in the lower altitudes produce in abundance fruit of the most excellent quality; the grape, the peach, the apple, and the melon attain, in their season, nearer perfection than in any other State; the San Luis Valley, greater than all Massachusetts, and partially irrigated, produced this year wheat which commanded the premium at the late Columbian Exposition over all competing specimens of wheat from the whole world; in portions of the eastern part of our State, in the plains region, generally supposed to be fit only for pasturage, good crops of grain for several years have been produced by a sort of trench system of cultivation without irrigation; our mountains and cañons outcrop with granite and limestone, and our hills and valleys often abound with marble and onyx; our coal deposits rival in quantity and quality those of Pennsylvania and Tennessee combined. Colorado has reservoirs of oil upon both sides of the Rocky Mountains, and probably more extensive oil-fields than have previously been discovered in the United States; and it has mines of the baser metals, and of silver and gold unsurpassed in richness and extent by any mineral producing region of equal area on the face of the globe. But, our State has had its peculiar misfortunes. When the price of bullion silver declined to 72 cents, the mines were compelled to shut down; the miners lost

their employment. Some of them were young men at work for wages, but a large proportion were men of middle age, who came to the Rocky Mountains years ago on the invitation of President Lincoln after the civil war; they had made their settlement on the unsurveyed lands of the Government in the most precipitous defiles and the wildest cañons, and paid four times the price per acre of the public lands of the United States when they secured a patent. They have also paid ten dollars' worth of work per acre, per annum, to retain a possessory title to unpatented mining properties. These men had invested their earnings in houses and lots, in homes, stores, shops, and all kinds of improvements in the mining camps, to give their families the advantages of schools and churches, and found themselves not only deprived of employment, but also of the value of all their property.

Our agriculturists, who for years have had in the mining camps of the State the best market in the Union, almost at their very doors, find their market closed, and the prices of their staple products so reduced as hardly to pay freight when shipped east of Kansas and Nebraska. The stock-raisers are largely in the same condition, and the merchant, mechanic, and professional man find their sources of income destroyed. The annual production of 27,000,000 ounces of silver cut off by the closing of the mines has deprived Colorado of about \$24,000,000 per annum—its hitherto chief resource for cash to pay debts, interest on debts, living expenses, necessities, and luxuries. In the depressed condition of the silver mines there is little profitable demand for our coal, iron, marble, lime, and oil, which so liberally abound in our hills and valleys. Our gold-fields are being extensively prospected and will nearly double the yield of the previous year, but this does not help the silver mines or restore the lost value of property in the silver camps.

Now comes the question, Is there a remedy?

Great Britain, which demonetized silver in 1816, secretly procured, in the American Congress, the passage of an act, in 1857, providing that "No foreign gold or silver coins shall be a legal tender for the payment of debts." At this time there was no pretence that the foreign silver dollars were of depreciated value. In fact the bullion silver in these coins was then actually worth more than their coin value. The act of 1857 removed an ancient landmark, and reversed the policy of this

government for eighty-one years—thirteen years under the Continental Congress, 1776 to 1789, and sixty-eight years under our present form of government, from 1789 to 1857. All this time the Spanish milled dollar, and, after the yoke of Spain had been thrown off, the dollars of Mexico and South America, containing not less than $371\frac{1}{4}$ grains of fine silver, had been legal tender in the United States by tale at 100 cents each.

The right of Congress to coin money is conceded, also that the right is *exclusive* so long as the right is *exercised*. The States made the concession in 1789, not that the right might be destroyed, but that it might be exercised. Prior to the adoption of the present Constitution of the United States, the mints of the several States were open to all who desired to have coined either gold or silver bullion, and this privilege of the people of all the States was given to Congress by the States, that the right of free coinage might be continued, only the United States Mint was to take the place and perform the office of the State mints.

The right to regulate the value of domestic and foreign coins was conceded to Congress, as all contemporary history proves, in order that there might be a uniformity of value of money in the different States, and an equality as to debtor and creditor rights in contracts, the equity of which largely depends on the fixed value of money. The right "to coin money, regulate the value thereof and of foreign coins" was not given to Congress to be arbitrarily exercised, or changed or withheld at executive or congressional whim or caprice. When Congress, in 1792, created a money unit for the United States, and specified $371\frac{1}{4}$ grains fine silver as composing that unit and the American dollar, the trust given to Congress by the States to fix the value of the American dollar and of foreign coins was executed, and thenceforth neither the trustor (the States) nor the trustee (Congress) had any power whatever to recall or change the performance of the trust. Mr. Blaine said, February 7, 1878, in the United States Senate (*Cong. Record*, vol. 7, part 1, page 820):

"I believe gold and silver money to be the money of the Constitution—indeed the money of the American people anterior to the Constitution—which that great organic law recognized as quite independent of its own existence. No power was conferred on Congress to declare that either metal *should not be money*. Congress has therefore, in my judgment, no power to demonetize silver any more than to demonetize gold; no power to demonetize either, than it has to demonetize both."

He then quoted that greatest of constitutional lawyers, Daniel Webster, as saying that :

"gold and silver, at rates fixed by Congress, constitute the legal standard of value in this country, and neither Congress nor any State has authority to establish any other standard or to displace that standard."

The right to regulate the value of foreign coins is also in Congress, and must also be considered exclusive, unless the right "to make gold and silver coin a tender in the payment of debts," which right is expressly declared by the Constitution of the United States to be in the States, does not, in order to make that right of any practical use, include the right to regulate the value of the coin when made a legal tender. The right to make gold, silver, or paper money a legal tender is not specifically granted to Congress by the Constitution of the United States, but the right "to coin money, and regulate the value thereof and of foreign coins," expressly given to Congress in the United States Constitution, has been held by the courts to include the right to make those coins a legal tender.

The right of a State to make gold and silver coin a tender in payment of all debts collectable within that State cannot be denied. It is true that the right is enumerated among the restrictions of Section X., Art. 1, of the Constitution, and it was a restriction of the right of the States to make legal tender. Prior to the adoption of the United States Constitution, the States had the right to emit bills of credit, and to make them, as well as gold and silver coin, a legal tender. The right to make paper money or bills of credit a legal tender was taken away from the States, but the right to make gold and silver coins a legal tender was not.

The words "No State shall make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in the payment of debts," in view of the fact that previously the States possessed and exercised the right to make gold, silver, and bills of credit a legal tender, restricts the States only from making paper money or bills of credit a legal tender. The right to make gold and silver coin a legal tender is not derived from the Constitution of the United States. That power was already in the States when that Constitution was adopted, and by the use of the word "but," in the negative statement of the clause above quoted, the power was affirmed. The United States Constitution leaves the right of a State to make gold and silver

coins a tender in the payment of debts precisely as it was before that constitution was adopted. Prior to the adoption of the United States Constitution, all the States made both domestic and foreign coins a legal tender; indeed, the bulk of the silver circulation in the United States was foreign coin, and remained so for many years after the establishment of the present government. Until 1857, the United States always recognized the Spanish milled dollar and the dollars of Mexico, Central and South America, containing not less than $371\frac{1}{4}$ grains fine silver, as legal tender by tale. There can be no doubt of the right of any State to make gold and silver coin tender in the payment of debts collectable in that State. It is equally clear that this right extends to foreign coin, because at the time the Constitution was adopted, and for several years after, there were no national coins. It may be said Congress enacted in 1857 that thereafter no foreign coins should be a legal tender in the United States. *But no act of Congress can deprive a state of a constitutional right.* Admit that the right of the United States is concurrent with that of the States, and that Congress could lawfully pass the statute of 1857, that statute is only entitled to its legal effect. It is good in all territory over which the United States has exclusive jurisdiction; it is good in all States which have not or do not avail themselves of their constitutional right to make foreign gold and silver coin a legal tender, but cannot possibly take away that right. It may also be said that the right "to fix the value of domestic and foreign coins," being directly ceded to Congress, is taken away from the States, or, conceding that the States have an undoubted constitutional right to make foreign and domestic coins a legal tender, that the States cannot fix the value of those coins for legal tender purposes. The United States has no direct grant in the Constitution to make anything a legal tender, but the right to make legal tender has been conceded to Congress because it was necessary to make valid and effectual the grant "to regulate the value of domestic and foreign coins."

The word "tender" in this connection is defined by Webster as "that which is offered as money." A tender of money is unmeaning unless it includes a specification of value. The design of making legal tender is that it shall be a stable measure of value and thus be a fair and permanent register of indebtedness. In the history of the world at various periods and among differ-

ent nations, almost everything valuable has been made legal tender; but in every case the value of the legal tender was specified. The words "legal tender" imply that an offer to the creditor is of that which is made tender at a fixed valuation, which the creditor is compelled to take, or lose his claim. If the right to make gold and silver coins a legal tender does not carry with it the right to fix the value of the coins so made a legal tender, then the first right is wholly nugatory, and the decision of the U. S. courts "that a specific grant of power carries with it every other power necessary to make that grant valid and effectual" is false.

As a matter of constitutional law, there can be no doubt that the concurrent right of the national government to make legal tender does not in any way affect the right of a State to make gold and silver coins, domestic and foreign, a legal tender within its borders; and yet there is no necessity that there should be any conflict of authority between any State and the general government. In 1792, Congress enacted that $371\frac{1}{4}$ grains fine silver should constitute the money-unit of the United States, or the American dollar. This power was given by the States to Congress in order that it might create a legal uniformity of value of money in all the States, and, such a money-unit having been created, there is high authority that the trust given to Congress in this respect is executed, and can neither be changed by Congress nor the States.

Daniel Webster recognized the constitutional right of a State to make a legal standard of money, but held that the value of such tender must be the money-unit established in 1792. So long as the general government made the silver dollar of the United States and the foreign dollars of our sister-republics in North and South America legal tender at not less than $371\frac{1}{4}$ grains fine silver to the dollar, there was no necessity for any State to legislate as to legal tender.

The remedy is for each State to enact that the silver dollars of the United States and of our sister republics in North and South America, containing not less than $371\frac{1}{4}$ grains fine silver, shall be a legal tender by tale, or at 100 cents each, for all debts, public and private, collectable within that State.

DAVIS H. WAITE.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE SCHOOL FUND.

BY THE RIGHT REV. WILLIAM CROSWELL DOANE, BISHOP
OF ALBANY.

ON Sunday, November 19th, 1893, in the *The Sunday Democrat*, a "Weekly Family Journal devoted to the Propagation and Defence of Catholic Truth, Irish Home Rule, Literature, Politics, Etc.," published in New York City, there appeared the following petition and text of a proposed law :

LET JUSTICE BE DONE.

It is proposed to circulate the following petition in the 901 parishes of the State of New York, and secure the signature of the majority of the voters of the State :

"TO THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

"PETITION OF THE TAXPAYERS AND THE PEOPLE OF THE — ASSEMBLY
DISTRICT.

"The petition of the parents and friends of the children attending the parish schools attached to the church of — showeth that we, the undersigned, desire to bring before the Legislature parental claims and grievances in respect to the education of our children, for which we crave consideration and redress.

"As the State has made education compulsory, we desire to insist upon a fuller recognition by the State of the parental right, given by the law of nature, to educate our children in schools which possess our entire confidence, without our being subjected on that account to financial loss or embarrassment. Our conscientious repugnance to send our children to any but Catholic schools for their education is insuperable.

"The continually growing difficulties placed in the way of the maintenance of our Catholic schools, by the increasing number of children who attend them, make it every day more difficult to maintain those schools which alone meet our legitimate requirements.

"The compulsion to pay rates towards the exclusive support of schools which our religious convictions do not approve is an injustice which we pray your honorable body to redress.

"Your petitioners, therefore, humbly pray that the school fund be distributed, in due proportion, to every school whose efficiency in secular in-

struction shall satisfy the Education Department of the State—proper facilities being afforded for securing the right disbursement of the money paid over from the rates, while the Catholic management of our schools shall remain intact. And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.”

The following bill will be proposed by a Republican Senator at an early session of the next Legislature:

“AN ACT FOR THE PROMOTION OF EDUCATION THROUGHOUT
THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

“(Drafted by DENIS A. SPELLISSY, of the New York Bar.)

“The People of the State of New York, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

“SEC. 1. That whenever any individual, or body or association of individuals, or any organization of persons, incorporated or unincorporated, shall have established a school for the free education of youth in the primary branches of education, to wit, reading, writing, and arithmetic, and such school shall have been in existence for the term of at least one year, with not less than fifty pupils in regular attendance, and shall have been submitted to a satisfactory inspection and examination thereof by the State or local board of school trustees, or such other persons as may from time to time be designated for the purpose, the person or persons, association or organization conducting or managing such school, shall be entitled to receive from the State (or city, or county, or district) each year a share of all State and other moneys now directed to be apportioned and distributed among the common schools, the same to be apportioned and distributed among them as directed to be apportioned and distributed among the common schools by Chapter 555 of the Laws of 1864.

“SEC. 2. Such sums shall be paid annually from time to time; *provided*, that such school shall be always open at reasonable times for inspection, as aforesaid, and that the pupils shall have passed a satisfactory examination at such stated times as may be determined by the board of school trustees in accordance with usages and regulations in force for the public schools of the State.

“SEC. 3. The provisions of this act shall apply only to primary and grammar schools, or schools in which the course of study is substantially equal to that in use in the public schools of the State.”

It is said now that this bill prepared for introduction into the New York Legislature, distributing the public moneys raised for common-school education among all sorts and conditions of schools, has not been submitted to the officials of the Roman Catholic diocese of New York, and that the petition prepared and to be sent to the nine hundred and one parishes (R. C.) in this State is irregular and no notice should be taken of it unless the bishops give their consent. So say the interviewers in the New York papers. So far, so good; but with or without the consent of the bishops (R. C.), notice has been taken of it, and will be, and ought to be.

The Roman Catholic Church, the world over, is singularly skillful and subtle in political arts; and it is possible at least that Mr. Spellissy and the editor of the *Catholic Herald* have been used for an end. Little elephants are often sent in first to try the depth of a river which the herd intends to cross; and if *they* do not get drowned, the big elephants venture safely. This particular stream of strong, united, American public feeling about the common-school system is deep enough, I think, to drown the biggest elephants there are in America. Whether the Spellissy bill is now discredited, and whether it will be withdrawn from consideration, remain to be seen; but the thing that is really discredited is the attempt to sectarianize public education, and that cannot be withdrawn from consideration. I desire to deal with this question purely from the point of view of an American citizen. If I were dealing with it on the platform of a church congress, or in a periodical in the interests of the portion of the Catholic Church to which I belong, there are a good many things that I should feel bound to say which are out of place in an article of this sort. I should feel bound to *enlarge* upon the assumptions and assertions of the Roman Church, as witnessed over and over again, by utterances of her chief Bishop in Rome and of her leading clergymen in America; as to her right to interfere in the politics of every country in which she is placed; as to the supreme authority of the Bishop of Rome to claim their allegiance before any allegiance which they owe to the government under which they live; as to her emphatic and entire condemnation of the whole theory of public-school education; as to the groundlessness of her claim to be, to the exclusion of all other Christian people, the Catholic Church, which Protestants have foolishly allowed her to do by giving her the name of *Catholic*, instead of the name *Roman*, which she herself chooses in the Tridentine creed of Rome; and so on. But I am speaking now simply as a citizen, and not as an ecclesiastic, and addressing, not members of any one religious body, much less of that to which I belong, but the American people.

The Roman Catholic Church in America has posed a good deal before the public in civic affairs. She seems to be keeping a sort of perpetual feast of *Assumption*; and her attitude in regard to getting control of public moneys for her own ends is too patent to be denied. The miscalled "freedom of worship bill" passed two

years ago in New York with a part of its sting taken out, and the enormous disproportion of money secured by her in Washington for her Indian schools, are evidence enough ; and now she is looking after the educational funds of the State. What Roman Catholics really think about common school education is not easy to discover because of the contradictoriness of their utterances on the subject. Just now Cardinal Gibbons, a Paulist Father, a layman of the New York Bar, and the editor of "a weekly family journal devoted to the propagation and defence of Catholic truth, Irish home rule, literature, and politics," speak with the most distinct determination and with the most positive assurance, as to the rightfulness and necessity and possibility of securing this State aid for the support of Roman Catholic schools. On the other hand, the distinguished Archbishop of New York, with the lay trustees of his Cathedral, is understood to deny all knowledge of the bill and all sympathy with the movement. And the *Baltimore Sun*, whose proprietors are pronounced Roman Catholics, deals with the case in a most able and temperate editorial as to what they call "the unwelcome signs of a disposition on the part of a number of zealous but impractical people to revive the public school question in the acute form." I am glad to quote later on the closing words of this most admirable article, earnestly desiring that we all might come to agree with its principles ; and that any discussion of the subject may be conducted with the same temperate courtesy which marks the language of the editor of the *Baltimore Sun*.

Behind this present difficulty of discovering the real opinions of Roman Catholics on this subject, are previous, and more official, inconsistent and contradictory statements. There are three apparent propositions recently brought before the minds of American citizens. First, the insistence that all Roman Catholic children shall be kept away from common schools and forced to attend their own parochial schools. So far as a person outside could read the Decrees, this seemed to be the plain statement of the Council in Baltimore. Secondly, that the State should take charge of the parochial schools and support them, the buildings with their teachers and furniture being handed over bodily, with the understanding that religious teaching should be given to the pupils out of school hours. This is the so-called

Faribault plan, as plain people understand it. Between these two things the infallible Head of the Roman Church has recently decided in a manner worthy of the oracle of Delphi, cordially supporting *both* plans, in spite of their absolute antagonism. And now comes the third scheme—to take the money raised for the education of all the children in the State and distribute it, *pro rata*, among all sorts of schools, private, religious, irreligious, anything, so the school is a year old and has more than fifty pupils. Minnesota has spoken with no little emphasis against Archbishop Ireland's plan. I am disposed to think that before long New York will be not less emphatic as to the last scheme of these "irresponsible persons." And it looks as if the Roman Catholics would have to do what the rest of us do, support their own denominational schools. But the question has been raised, and it cannot be put down, either by supercilious misunderstanding of the English language on the one hand, or by the use of violent language on the other.

The Roman Catholic Church throughout the world is really two or three absolutely distinct and different things. Whatever one may feel about the schism which it is, and the schisms it has caused; or, however deeply one may deplore the novelties with which it has overlaid the old faith (which, like all novelties, being on the top are the things most thought of and most dwelt on by her people), these are not matters for discussion here or now. In spite of these, she is to every intelligent mind an ancient and venerable portion of the Christian Church; and in her discharge of her ecclesiastical and religious duties, is to be protected and respected, teaching other Christians many lessons of devotion, consistency and courage, which we should do well to learn. Beside this, she is a factor in the lives of thousands of people, citizens of our country, who are kept from evil living by her ministrations and control; and when we consider the fact that the enormous majority of the crowded poor belong to her communion, that perhaps the most turbulent element in our citizenship owes at least a faint and nominal allegiance to her authority, that without the control of her priesthood, we should be powerless to deal, except by brute force, with great masses of the workingmen of America; we must certainly be ready to secure to her every opportunity for doing the legitimate work of a great Christian Church. Over and above this—and I say it

with no unkindness—since an overwhelming proportion of the inmates of our institutions of reform consist of her people, it seems right to me, provided no money for the support of religious services comes from the State funds, that her clergymen should have access to the inmates of these institutions under proper regulations. The Roman Church is also a beneficent institution, with multiplied and manifold Orders and agencies of mercy and charity, in the support of which, and in their methods of administration, she is not only to be protected, but greatly admired and imitated by others. But beside all this the Roman Church is a tremendous piece of human machinery cleverly and cunningly devised, and sticking together with a coherency which, in spite of innumerable divisions of belief, opinions, and parties, presents an apparent organic, cohesive unity, which gives it great power. It is beyond peradventure that it is a great political force and factor. It is able to mass its adherents on almost any question, and it does not hesitate to say so in advance. The boast is made that this proposed petition, not yet, we are told by authority, sent out, will receive 800,000 signatures from the 901 parishes (R. C.) of the State of New York. And one of the Paulist Fathers says that 10,000,000 Roman Catholic citizens insist upon educating their children in their own system. Of course this is not an intelligent expression, either of 800,000 or of 10,000,000 of individuals. It is merely a great flock of sheep following, not so much, the shepherd as the bell-wether. It is like the calling together of thousands of men on a strike, because a self-chosen leader orders it, though the individuals prefer to go on as they are.

With her theory of the essential importance of definite religious teaching, as part of any thorough education, I have the most entire sympathy; and while she founds parochial schools and maintains them herself, I have the most absolute respect for her consistency. But she has no reason to come, *in forma pauperis*, to ask the State to aid her in this. For while multitudes of the poorest people are in her communion, she has enormous wealth, both in personal membership, in wisely acquired property, and, if rumor speaks true, in very large assistance from the Roman Propaganda. At this moment millions of her money are spending in Washington, Hoboken and elsewhere, on her educational institutions, which she is abundantly able to support.

It seems inconsistent with a spirit of any real martyrdom to complain of the hardship of what she is doing, as a witness to her convictions of duty and truth. When she comes, *in forma ecclesiæ*, to demand or to ask for help to train her children in her own way, then we say not only she has no reason, but she has no right to come.

We may dismiss the question of the effect of breaking up this educational fund into various appropriations; though it must be patent that it would destroy the efficiency of our chosen system of public schools; would foster sectarian rivalries, and deepen the lines of religious division. The editor of the *Sun* suggests what I think is plainly involved in this, that if the public money were to be divided between parochial and public schools,

"an immediate demand would be heard from Protestants that Catholic (R. C.) teachers should retire from the public schools, along with the Catholic (R. C.) pupils. This would be the practical destruction of our common-school system. It would divide the nation's children, its future citizens, into two opposing camps, and breed in time the same sharp and bitter antagonisms that have proved such fruitful sources of disturbance to the political and social peace of European countries."

We may also dismiss the apparent generalness of the bill, in providing that all or any other people may ask for and get the same thing. The title of the bill answers itself. The American way "to promote education" is to increase common schools, and not to multiply private enterprises; and the fact remains that among the most fundamental principles of this general government is the absolute separation of Church and State. And the use of State money for Church uses is at once the lowest and the most dangerous place to begin to break it down. Make out of it what one will, it is impossible to escape the fact that every penny of public school money given to any religious body for education is using the power of the State to tax, and the result of that taxation to further and support the religious tenets of that body. We can afford, it seems to me, to take and hold a firm and quiet stand upon this inherent principle.

Next to this is the other question of "rights." We are very much given to talking about this word as implying a good many things to which it is not applicable. We ought to be far more concerned with duties than with rights. It is the duty of the State to protect itself and its people from the misery and sin of ignorance, but it is not the right of any child to demand this

from the State. It is the duty of every Church and of every Christian parent to protect itself and its children from the misery and sin of irreligion ; but this must be done by the Church or by the parent; and it is neither the duty of the government to do it, nor the right of any individual or of any Church to ask it of the government. The steady, quiet maintenance of these two principles is an irresistible vantage-ground.

I am forced to say a word about the distinction, which some of us are said to make between Roman Catholics and Americans. It is quite true in certain ways that they are American citizens, by naturalization or by birth ; by the right of protection from the flag under which many of them fought gallantly ; and in many instances, by their loyal love of their adopted country. Very many of their people, left to themselves, would forget their other allegiance. But their leaders keep it up. The bishop across the sea has no idea of letting go of it. Their public documents assert it positively ; and their strong religious associations, their virtual separation from all the rest of American citizens in their religious life, their undisguised contempt for all Protestant bodies, their religious exclusiveness, their clannishness, make them a sort of "empire within an empire." And if the question ever came, which God forbid, between their yielding obedience to the American republican principles, or obedience to the Roman authority, large numbers of them would be almost compelled to surrender political loyalty to what they thought the higher law. The alienism of Roman Catholicism does not depend upon the citizenship of its people, three-fourths or all of them, by birth or by adoption for two generations or for twenty. It depends upon the fact that their first allegiance is owed to a foreigner, stripped of all temporal power even in his own country, but convinced that it belongs to him by divine right, and claiming an absolute and infallible authority and control over everybody and everything everywhere. And it depends no less on the effect produced upon conscience and character, by its peculiar system of mental and moral training. No system of any kind ought to be judged by its results, where they have been wrought out under circumstances and conditions which limit or control them. Anarchy, for instance, is not as bitter or as blasphemous in America as it is in Russia, because it is modified by a certain atmosphere of national freedom ; but at heart, it is really

as much set against the limited authority of our free institutions, as against autocracy itself. Unbelief is less blatant in a Christian country than it was in unmitigated heathendom, because necessarily it is modified by its Christian surroundings, of which it partakes, and which it imbibes, and is influenced by, to a degree. And in the same way, extreme Romanism, partly from policy and partly from unavoidable influence, is less absolutely papal, in certain appearances, in America than it is in Mexico or in Spain. It is held in abeyance. But, as it can, and where it may, the essential tendencies will betray themselves. I do not believe that the majority of the Roman Catholic people are at heart un-American, any more than I believe that the great majority of workingmen who go on a strike act intelligently or willingly. But the leaders in both cases are extremists. They have control, and they use it; and the wise thing now to do is to go behind professions, behind general statements of loyalty, behind exterior proofs of it, like the claim of the number of Roman Catholics in the northern army during the civil war; and to see what are the inflexible assertions of her unchanging policy. Agnostics, indifferentists, may afford to be careless as to religious results. But the civil questions concern every citizen; and Roman Catholic citizens ought to weigh this as well as all others. Two or three specimens of the root principles and claims of Rome must suffice. The episcopal oath of allegiance to the Bishop of Rome contains the promise "to persecute to the utmost heretics, schismatics, and rebels against the pope." The Encyclical of Pius IX. anathematizes almost every proposition of what we know as civil or religious liberty, *e. g.*, liberty to profess the religion a man believes, the system of instructing youth apart from the Catholic faith, the separation of Church and State. This is the paper of which Mr. Gladstone said that it "required every man to forfeit his moral and mental freedom and to place his loyalty and civil duty at the mercy of another."

I feel, as strongly as any man can, the unfortunateness of introducing any question that touches upon religion into civil and political matters. But if Rome chooses to introduce it, she must take the consequences, and not vituperate those who oppose her schemes. Out of this contention and controversy, indiscriminate abuse and violent denunciation certainly ought to be

kept. But truth must be stated baldly and plainly; and it is somewhat difficult to avoid strong and almost severe language, under the excessive provocation of Roman arrogance and assumption. I think that we outsiders are largely responsible for this. To begin with, she has been allowed without protest to take and use the name of "the Catholic Church," when really her own self-chosen definition in the creed of the Council of Trent is "Roman." In this very last year, we have rather applauded and certainly accepted her claim, which has put her into curiously public prominence, that we are indebted to her for the discovery of America; without stopping to think of the foolishness of each part of the claim, either that Columbus discovered North America, or that it was in the interests of the Roman Church and so gives her a pre-emptive right of ecclesiastical possession and control. Some few people have protested against this, but their voices have been drowned in the popular clamor, which played chorus to the loud assertions of the Church. And in this same year, with a sort of feeling that really we have been complimented and honored by a great personage, our newspapers have been taken up, either with the difficulties of Dr. McGlynn or Dr. Burtzell, or with the differences between Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Corrigan, or with the movements of Monsignor Satolli, who could not have been more notorious, if he had been Plenipotentiary Extraordinary from all the sovereigns of Europe to all the United States; instead of being the powerless envoy of a single bishop, to settle or unsettle the ecclesiastical quarrels of his own Church. And while in all these ways, and in some other ways by no means so creditable, the Jesuits are trying to Romanize America, we sit by, delighted with the dream that somebody is Americanizing Roman Catholicism. Such things make it hard to use temperate language in denouncing the tireless and vigorous schemes of self-aggrandizement. But we are on the defensive in this matter behind good breast-works, with an overwhelming majority on the American side, when the issue is finally raised.

The Roman Catholic Church is committed by a tradition of centuries, by the history of almost all countries in the world, to perpetual political interference. It has cost her the choicest jewels of her crown in England, on the continent of Europe, and in Japan. But she cannot let it alone. And we cannot afford not to read

the experiences of the past into the appearances of the present. Thank God, the day is passed when religion can resort to the secular arm to maintain its demands. And let us pray God that the day is passed when such demands may be met by the violence of men. But it will not do to say that the "riotous burnings and murders of the know-nothing period" were due to the violence of Protestant denunciations. They were due to what lay behind the denunciations, the intrusions and interferences of Rome in public and civil affairs. It is very easy for Ahab to say to Elijah, "Art thou he that troubleth Israel?"; but the truth is that Rome was the troubler then, and will be now, unless all temptation to this kind of thing is positively removed. Let me quote again the wise language of the *Baltimore Sun*:

"We regard this whole agitation, therefore, as unwise. Catholics and Protestants have lived together in peace and mutual respect, and their children have met on the neutral ground of the free public school, with the inevitable result of knitting them in the bond of a common patriotism for forty years past. To array them now against each other will be a lamentable thing. We want no more fuel provided for a second know-nothing conflagration. Let the public schools alone. Leave private schools of every sort and name to be carried on by private enterprise, and let us have peace."

Such words give one almost the hope that there is power in the appeal, to remind Rome to keep within the limits of her legitimate sphere. Even if that may not be, the appeal ought to be heeded, which the present opportunity makes to all intelligent, non-Roman citizens, to arrest the movement at the start, and to put up now a barrier which shall prevent the recurrence at any future time. Take away the possibility, and the attempt will not be made. Once let it be seen and known that the enormous majority of American citizens, willing to respect the Roman Catholic Church and to protect her in her rights, will not tolerate any ecclesiastical interference, foreign or domestic, with our established system of education, or with our national and political affairs, and the agitation will stop. And the only way to do this, is neither by interviews, nor violent controversy, nor by the defeat of the movement in a single year; but by submitting, as a test question to the people of America, an amendment to the Constitution; and, this year, by submitting to the Constitutional Convention in this State, an amendment to our State Constitution, absolutely prohibiting the use of any State patronage or public money in the interests of any religious body at all.

WM. CROSWELL DOANE.

DINNERS AND DINERS.

BY LADY JEUNE.

THE feasts and banquets of former days are, mercifully for us in these later times, relegated to public occasions only, and are regarded as a doubtful pleasure by those who are obliged to partake of them. Hospitality, which used to be dispensed wholesale, is now spread over a larger and wider area ; but dinner has become the distinctive repast of England, and the giving of dinner is the way in which English people best like to entertain and show hospitality to their friends. In other countries hospitality is dispensed in other ways, though, indeed, among certain classes in society abroad dinner is as important an event as with us. In England both the size of our houses and our daily occupations prevent those who live in towns from receiving strangers as their guests. Our English country life represents among our people that particular form of hospitality, but in London we are driven perforce to confine our hospitality to the dinner-hour, and it is at an English dinner-table that we exhibit one of the most pleasant aspects of English life. There is no prettier sight, none more characteristic of the ease and luxury in which we live, than a large, well-arranged dinner-table in London ; and this is not in any way the monopoly of the rich, for nowadays, when the decoration of rooms is not expensive, when flowers are fairly cheap, and when the taste of Englishwomen has so much improved, it is in the power of every hostess to make her entertainment as pretty as she can desire. The clean white cloth, the sparkling glass, the shaded light, the smell of the fresh flowers, and the well-dressed women surrounding the table form a brilliant centre to the finely decorated dining-rooms of most of the houses in London.

Nothing can be more different than the dinner of to-day to

that of thirty years ago, and the change is in every way an advantage. A long table, covered with empty silver *entrée* dishes, on each of which in due time eight, or ten, or more *entrées* and joints, according to the number of guests, were deposited, to be solemnly taken round in turn, is the part most vividly impressed on one's memory. One had always the most profound pity for the host and hostess, who were obliged to carve the joint at their respective ends of the table, the duty in the hostess' case generally falling to the unhappy man who took her in to dinner, and who consequently got no dinner himself. The cooking was heavy and coarse and the food most substantial; for quantity, not quality, was the distinctive characteristic of the repast. The art of carving was a necessary accomplishment, and it was wonderful to see the dexterity and neatness with which a good carver could minister to the wants of a large party from a very ordinary sized joint. As dinner was served upon the table, artistic cooks had great opportunity to devise pretty looking dishes, and there was always plenty of scope for their talents in the endless array of puddings, jellies, etc., which came at the end of the feast. To families who were possessed of fine plate, a dinner-table in those days was a magnificent sight, covered as it was with all the treasures of the family plate-chest, and the heavy cut-glass was also in its way an embellishment. In houses where there is a fine collection of plate, it is even now always used for decorating the table. Nothing can be more gorgeous or brilliant than the display of silver and gold at Windsor at state dinners, when the Queen's plate, which is the finest in the world, is exhibited.

The custom of removing the tablecloth after dinner and arranging the dessert on the plain mahogany table has also passed away, and in many ways one regrets it. Nothing looked prettier than the brown mahogany table, burnished almost to the brilliancy of a looking-glass, covered with large silver dishes of fruit, and silver candelabra, with its fringe of bright color from the dresses of the women sitting around it. The modern fashion of covering the table with flowers has made the retention of this custom impossible, and it is rarely seen now except in houses where an old mahogany table is still looked on as a precious relic of the ancient customs.

In former days the real business of the evening only began with the removal of the cloth and the retirement of the ladies, for

not until then did the men of the party really devote themselves to what was considered the important part of the evening's amusement. It was when the ladies had retired to the drawing-room for the long, dreary time before the men appeared, that the host produced the treasures of his cellar for his guests, and that they in return gave up a large portion of the evening to their consumption. In fact, dinner was an occasion in which everything was sacrificed to the one object of having a "heavy drink." The wines drunk were of a much heavier kind than now, and much more was drunk after dinner. Champagne, sherry, claret, and burgundy were drunk during the meal, the two latter, as well as port, during dessert. There was no smoking after dinner, for cigarettes were unknown, and so, facing a phalanx of bottles in silver stands, the men drank on steadily during the evening. How well one remembers the long time after dinner, when all the jokes and scandal were exhausted, and in sheer desperation a "little music" was proposed in the vain hope that the warbling sounds might tempt the faithless revellers away. For the moment the heavy wines of those days are no longer drunk. Champagne is the fashionable wine, and it is drunk almost universally during and after dinner. The possessors of fine cellars may grumble, as they do, at the degeneracy of to-day, but after a cigarette and a glass or two of champagne, every one wants to get to the drawing-room, and many are the complaints one hears of the bottles of claret opened after dinner and left untouched.

The serious, dull, heavy, and expensive dinner, had its doom sealed when the custom of serving dinner *à la Russe* came into vogue. The conservatism of English society would have struggled much longer against the innovation but for the fact that its adoption reduced the expense of entertaining enormously. Instead of heavy joints, endless *entrées* and puddings, a dinner could consist of as little or as much as the hostess felt inclined to give. The trouble of carving was obviated, and in all ways the fashion was a distinct improvement. For some years old-fashioned people struggled against it, and even now there are perhaps one or two houses where the host still clings to his old prejudices, but the instances are so few one can hardly name them. With the introduction of dinners *à la Russe* the whole condition of cooking changed, and the lighter but richer *cuisine*

of the French was adopted. The time of transition was a terrible one to those who remember it, for the English cooking of some thirty years ago was very bad, as English cooks were not *artistes*, and for one good dinner there were hundreds of very bad ones.

But let us be thankful that the period of transition is passed and that English people have realized that good plain cooking is infinitely to be preferred to an ambitious bad French *cuisine*, and that a good plain dinner is within the reach of every one. The National School of Cookery at South Kensington has done much towards improving the English *cuisine*, and though it is vastly worse and more extravagant than that of any other country, it is not nearly as bad as it was. There is great room yet for improvement, for our dinners are still much too long and we give too much to eat. Persons dining alone would never dream of consuming the amount of food they eat every time they dine out, and there can be no possible reason why any one should eat more in company than when alone. Some attempts are being made to reduce the quantity of food and the time taken to consume it, and dining, as we do now, at half-past eight must doubtless help to shorten it; otherwise a dinner would last well on into the night.

No dinner should consist of more than eight dishes, viz., soup, fish, *entrée*, joint, game, sweet, *hor-d'œuvre*, and perhaps an ice, but each dish should be perfect of its kind, and no dinner should last more than an hour and a quarter if properly served. Instead of this, dinners are constantly two hours long, and we double the quantity of food I mention. Can anything be more wearisome, tiring to the digestion, and wearing to one's self and one's neighbors than two hours' conversation with no chance to escape, without even the privilege, if one is bored, of being silent? Even the greatest wit, the most brilliant *raconteur*, becomes monotonous after such a trial. Nothing can be in worse taste and more wearisome than a long heavy repast, which is served with great ostentation, and where the guests are made to feel that their duty is to direct time and energy to the sole task of getting through and tasting each dish that is brought to them.

There are some houses, indeed, where the dinner is so proverbially good that to expect to be amused and also well fed is to be guilty of real ingratitude; while in others, though gastronomically one does not fare as well, one is better entertained. Such

dinners as the latter are becoming more exceptional, for the average cooking in England has so much improved one rarely runs the risk of being poisoned, and the great mixture of society prevents one from being insufferably dull.

A really pleasant dinner-party ought never to be a very large one, but the rapidly increasing size of London society almost entirely precludes people who entertain a great deal from enjoying the pleasure of a small one. The golden rule of hospitality should be always to return the civility of others, and one should not dine at the house of any person whom one does not intend to invite in return. However strictly people may adhere to this rule, the size of society makes dinners, as well as all other forms of entertainment, large, and the number of guests is generally limited only by the size of the dining-room. The traditionally ideal dinner, which ought to consist of eight or ten people, well known to one another, and all good talkers, at a round table, so that the conversation may be general, has become a dream of the past; and in its place we have the large dinner of to-day, at which general conversation is out of the question, and where one is limited to the society of one's next-door neighbors.

Sometimes where there is space, two tables are an ingenious way of dividing guests, and of diminishing the sense of oppression which a very large dinner always gives. But we have not adopted the plan with any great alacrity in England, from the strong objection any social change always encounters at its initiation in this most conservative country. Many people object to it from an idea that the company at the other table is more amusing than at theirs, and others object when the tables are multiplied (as they sometimes are) indefinitely, on the ground that it is like a restaurant. It is, however, in many respects a better way than arranging the dinner at the large ordinary dinner-table, where anything like general conversation is out of the question. Conversation can be more or less general at a table of eight, ten, or twelve guests; besides this is a less formal mode of entertainment. The great length of dinners in London, and their lateness, have been mainly brought about by the late hour at which after-dinner society begins, for no one goes to a ball before midnight, and the evening has to be killed in some way or other; and thus dinners grow later every year. Now a quarter past eight is the usual invitation,

and half past eight or a quarter to nine is not too liberal an interpretation of the invitation.

The composition of a dinner is one of the most important matters; and on that much of its success must depend. It is always a mistake to compose a dinner entirely of brilliant people, by that I mean intellectually brilliant. They are generally envious, critical of one another, and for these reasons none of them is seen at his best. One generally finds the pleasantest dinners are those composed of average people, for though a brilliant galaxy of guests gives a dinner a certain distinction, it is just as likely as not to be a dull one. I have a very vivid recollection of a dinner composed of people each of whom was distinguished in every sense of the word. A prime minister, two cabinet ministers, a distinguished soldier, one of the greatest ecclesiastics of the day, a brilliant scientific man, a great journalist, a distinguished lawyer, added to several agreeable and pretty women, made up a dinner which at first sight seemed to promise a rare feast of intellectual delight, but which one of the guests declared was the dulllest dinner he had ever sat down to. If such were always the case, one would despair of the arrangement of any dinner, and indeed the conviction is often forced on one that a judicious mixture of ordinary and brilliant people affords on the whole the best chance of giving a pleasant and successful one. Among a large number of guests a very brilliant talker is thrown away, for it is only at a small table when all the guests can hear and see and, if required, add their *quota* to the general flow of conversation that that such a person adds to the general enjoyment, though it should not, also, be forgotten that very often such a guest frightens others less brilliant than himself, absorbing all the attention, and stifling the efforts of his companions. What is required at dinner is that every one should be quick and sufficiently well educated to keep up the battledore and shuttlecock of small-talk, and that no one should be so much more brilliant and egotistical as to swamp every other person's individuality.

If we were to ask the majority of men what they consider the dulllest kind of dinners, they would certainly say those where there are no women; and women would naturally express the same opinion as regards dinners only of their own sex. The former is, of course, common enough, as business and professional men give such dinners, and there are many occasions when they are un-

avoidable. Women's dinners are not customary yet, nor indeed have they been much tried in England. Now and then some venturesome women have attempted to gather together a few enterprising sisters, and have banished the male element, and despite of the chaff and ridicule of the "lords of the creation," these are pleasant enough. With higher education and greater freedom of thought and conversation, the society of intelligent women in England is sufficiently enjoyable without the presence of men, though I know that this is an opinion in which there is no general concurrence. We have been brought up with the conviction that no form of entertainment is complete without men, and as the hour of dinner, the arrangement, the care bestowed on it, and the improvement of cooking have all grown out of that feeling, it requires courage not only to say this, but to believe it.

Girls are much more generally invited to dinners now than formerly, and they enjoy it enormously, but that, again, is the result of the great changes that have come over the intellectual position and interest of women in England. Thirty years ago few girls would have chosen a dinner in preference to a ball; now there are hundreds who would not hesitate for a moment as to their choice, for the range of thought and conversation is so wide, the subjects of discussion so varied, that a well-educated girl is well able to hold her own and take a part in the discussion of almost all the topics of the day. The presence of pretty girls enlivens and brightens up a dinner-table, and no man, however great and clever, need fear being bored by having only a girl to be his neighbor at a dinner-table.

The old saying as regards giving dinners in London, "Cutlet for cutlet," has fortunately long ceased to be true; no one is invited to dinner only because a dinner is expected in return. People are invited for every reason but that, and it is in the mixture and variety we meet at a dinner-table that the secret of its success rests. This gives it piquancy; and interests and even animosities, political differences, and social bitterness disappear under the soothing influence of "*Crème de volaille*, woodcock, Pommery, and cigarettes" and the society of pleasant and pretty women. It is idle to disguise that, of all social influences, none is more potent than the dinner-table. Every hostess will necessarily be careful not to invite impossible combinations; but in England, most people, however divergent their opinions or

occupations, forget them all under the softened light and soothing surroundings of an agreeable dinner-party. The story of how the present Speaker of the House of Commons, with rare tact, decided to waive all regulations about evening dress, and invited the advanced party in the House of Commons who abjured general society to dine with him at his official residence, is so well known that there is no indiscretion in alluding to it. One has heard over and over again how they met, and under the soothing influence of a good dinner, wine, and graceful hospitality, the conflicting elements were brought together and they passed an evening as unique as it was hilarious. Dinner is the great levelling institution of society. A party or a ball is an entertainment people are pleased at being invited to; but nothing brings classes together, nothing levels distinctions, nothing gives satisfaction, so much as dining at the same table. Hospitality is dispensed widely and lavishly enough in England, and the houses of the rich are open to the most cosmopolitan of crowds; but such society is outside and apart from that which is composed of the people one asks to dinner, and a dinner invitation is a sign that a recruit has been added to the ranks of the society which only bestows that recognition on a favored few. As I said before, the excellence of the *cuisine* is a point not to be disregarded; but given that the food is well cooked, people never think of it in comparison to the society they meet. The saying "I do not know what the dinner was like; I only know I enjoyed the evening very much" is the greatest tribute to the success of a host or hostess in amusing friends.

The best test of popularity is the number of invitations to dinner which people receive, and as, owing to the increasing size of society, dinners are exceeding in number every other form of invitation, popular people need rarely, if ever, dine at home; and their going out is simply limited to their powers of endurance and digestion. It must be this cause which has made it the fashion to give very long invitations to dinner; five or six weeks is not unusual in the season, and three weeks or a month is the usual time. Some people are unprocurable except at such a distance of time. To the entertainer it does not practically matter on what day his dinner is given, but the length of invitation often makes a refusal impossible; and cruel fate, which so loves to play mischievous tricks with us often sends another, if not more than one,

pleasant invitation for a date to which we are bound. It is impossible, except for a royal command, to throw over a dinner invitation ; it is the one social sin which we in England, who are indulgent enough in other respects, resent very keenly. Wednesdays and Saturdays are the days in London on which dinners are most frequent, as they are the only evenings on which the House of Commons does not sit, and it is impossible to get any member of the government to dine on any other evening during the session. On these evenings, therefore, the preponderance of guests is political. One of the few indications of the existence of Sunday observance in England still shows itself in the fact that few dinners are given on Sunday. The religious feeling against them still remains, and among business men, lawyers, and such like the idea that Sunday should be indeed a day of rest is still very strong, while among servants there is a great dislike to Sunday festivities.

With the rapidly increasing size of society in England it would be impossible for any kind of intimacy or friendship to grow up in the huge crowds where movement and conversation become daily more difficult, and therefore dinner has become and will continue to become a more important and more frequent event in our social life. It is the easiest and quickest way of getting people together and of bringing into contact those who otherwise would never meet—in some ways the most economical—and on all sides it is accepted as the pleasantest way of passing the few hours of leisure our busy life affords for recreation and rest. The real success of a dinner, however, must always rest on the hostess ; she is the presiding genius of the feast, and on her tact, cleverness and discretion must its fortunes depend. The secret of being a good hostess lies very much in a woman's thoroughly enjoying society. If she is happy and amused, her satisfaction spreads to her guests, and the whole party is inspired by her condition of mind. A nervous woman or one who does not really enjoy society never makes her dinner as pleasant, for she is continually haunted by the thought that something will go wrong or she is tired and bored, and her moods equally react on her surroundings. Nothing is more infectious than pleasure or *ennui*, and a hostess in either frame of mind makes or mars her party.

MARY JEUNE.

HOW TO PREVENT A MONEY FAMINE.

BY THE HON. JAMES H. ECKELS, COMPTROLLER OF THE
CURRENCY.

IT IS not proposed in this paper to undertake either a scientific discussion of the so-called "currency problem" or to institute a historical research into the currency conditions of either our own or other countries. The object sought is to state as briefly as possible certain propositions which, it is believed, are at least worthy of passing consideration and which now seem pertinent.

Following in the wake of every period of financial distress, business depression, and money famine there is always the currency agitator, who sees in the operation of existing currency laws the source of all this embarrassment, and in their entire abolishment or complete change the only remedy for past misfortunes and safe guarantee against future disaster. The present time is no exception, and once more he is abroad in the land, with the same zeal and pertinacity, preaching the same old doctrines which in their day served the advocate of an unlimited issue of greenbacks and the fiatist, and are now taught by the Farmers'-Alliance adherent, many of the proponents of the free and unlimited coinage of silver, and not a few of their aiders and abettors.

In the light of many of the suggestions upon the cause of and the cure for our financial ailments made by these champions of a new and different order of things, the truth of Professor Jevons's assertion that "Currency is to the science of economy what the squaring of the circle is to geometry or perpetual motion to mechanics" is fully demonstrated, and we may well believe, with him, that :

"If there were a writer on currency possessing some of the humor and learning of the late Professor De Morgan, he could easily produce a budget of currency paradoxes more than rivalling De Morgan's circle-squaring paradoxes. There are men who spend their time and fortunes in endeavoring to convince a dull world that poverty can be abolished by the issue of printed bits of paper. I know one gentleman who holds that exchequer bills are the panacea for the evils of humanity. Other philanthropists wish to make us all rich by coining the national debt, or coining everything. Another class of persons have long been indignant that, in this age of free trade, the mint price of gold should still remain arbitrarily fixed by statute. A member of Parliament lately discovered a new grievance, and made his reputation by agitating against the oppressive restrictions on the coinage of silver at the mint. No wonder so many people are paupers when there is a deficiency of shillings and sixpences, and when the amount merely of the rates and taxes paid in a year exceeds the whole sum of money circulating in the kingdom."

How familiar all these personages are to the student of the history of American finance! From the time that John Winthrop, the younger, first suggested the use of paper money in this country to the very present, they have gone up and down the land teaching and preaching the healing efficacy of great issues of currency, until we wonder, not at the disaster wrought by them, but that the devastation has not been more widespread. Fortunately in these latter days the good sense of our people has defeated many of the schemes of those who, by the necromancy of finance, would wipe out all indebtedness, and in the twinkling of an eye make riches abound to all. But here and there has crept into our monetary system some trace of their doctrines, though so strong in the past has been the consensus of public opinion when once aroused that John Stuart Mill, commenting upon it, said:

"It has been shown by many examples in the recent history of the United States that an agitation for something wrong and mischievous may go on for a certain length of time without visibly stirring up the good-sense and honesty of the country to resist it, but that, when the agitation attains a sufficient height to begin to be dangerous, a mass of opinion, which ordinarily remains quiescent, forces itself into activity, puts down the wrong thing, and peremptorily demands the right thing instead. Let us hope that this mass of wholesome opinion may always exist and prevail."

Never was the truthfulness of the statement of the distinguished English economist more forcibly illustrated than in the action of Congress upon the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman Silver Act. But all this agitation which ultimately results in accomplishing the right thing (always, however, after much harm has been done by the wrong) is inimical to

continued prosperity and ought in the largest measure possible to be avoided. It cannot be done away with entirely, for as long as governments exist monetary agitations will go on, but the harm done may be minimized by pursuing a course of conduct which will make it a difficult thing to enlist any considerable body of men in behalf of either visionary or dishonest schemes.

The question to which the friends of a sound money system should now address themselves is not how to temporarily defeat the desires of the Populists, the advocates of free coinage of silver, of government warehouses, and kindred plans, but how to permanently insure the country against the dangers which would flow from the crystallizing into law of their monetary and financial sophisms. Such result cannot be brought about by either scoffing at their leaders or scouting that which they propose. Neither will it do to underestimate the sources of strength of those who range themselves under the banner of the Populist and free-coinage parties. So long as they have the enthusiasm, which springs from the belief of lessening the woes of the debt-burdened classes, to urge them to effort, and the encouragement of the timorous and compromising in the ranks of those who oppose them, they will continue an active force in monetary agitation and an uncertain element in American politics, and, as such, warrant recognition and intelligent opposition.

These people are not to be deceived by empty promises, blinded by flattery, nor soothed into silence by splendid phraseology. They can be eliminated permanently as a factor worthy of consideration in but one way, and that lies in so educating the people in sound monetary principles that the fallacies of their teachings may be "known and read of all men." As long as terms of compromise are offered, they will increase in strength; as long as they are not beaten squarely upon the issues for which they stand, they will cling to the hope of ultimate success.

That which now is most needed is a campaign of education on monetary and financial questions. The education to be given ought to be systematic and thorough. It ought not to embrace either abstruse theories or illusive deductions. The freer it is of technicalities, the more complete will it be and the results accomplished more certain. It should be rid of all ambiguity and devoid of that enigmatical mystery which so long has cloaked the utterances of many of our skilled practical financiers only to create

“confusion worse confounded” in the minds of the public on the operation of finance and the workings of our currency system. There is much of truth in the statement of Professor Bonamy Price that :

“No science has suffered so severely at the hands of practical and empirical men as political economy. They have at all times propounded and acted on doctrines of the most elaborate kind. The more directly engaged in business was the speaker, the more complicated, the more artificial, the more mysterious have been the rules he laid down for the attainment of wealth.”

It may be urged, however, that all this involves interminable work, inexhaustible patience and great personal or political sacrifice, and that so long as a strong public opinion ultimately intervenes to prevent the full fruition of the threatened disaster, it is scarcely worth the while to anticipate by the use of a preventive. Unquestionably it necessitates work, requires patience and in some instances personal sacrifice, possibly the temporary laying aside of political ambitions; but the element most essential in such a campaign is the courage of conviction, strong enough to unequivocally assert itself upon monetary subjects and to couple with it an abiding faith in the ultimate triumph of sound principles and honest purpose. The gravest mistake of the professional politician and the cause of his most unexpected reverses rests in his underestimating the intelligence of the general people with whom he has to deal and the influence of principles, if boldly and intelligently announced, upon the public mind.

It was a favorite theory of Mr. Tilden—who, in point of acute statesmanship and sagacious political leadership, has never been surpassed in the annals of American politics, and who, as a financier, is to be ranked with Gallatin—that the important thing in a contest for political supremacy is to have an abiding faith in the ultimate triumph of that which appeals to the intelligence of the people. Upon a notable occasion, in receiving the congratulations of a body of young men upon his elevation to the chief magistracy of the State of New York, he said :

“We have to meet these political and social problems. We have to meet them with intelligence and courage and, above all, with trust in the masses of our people. I have been one of those who, amid periods pregnant with despondency, still retained that trust in the body of the American people with which I began life. I did not incline to censure those who sometimes felt despondent; but I myself never lost courage, never lost my

belief that the element of human society which seeks for what is good is more powerful, if we will but trust in it, than all those selfish combinations that would obtain advantage over the masses of the people."

If, in the campaign of financial education such as has been indicated, the same appreciation of the intelligent action of a rightly informed public enters, a successful outcome is assured.

In laying down the lines upon which it ought to be carried on, but two ideas should be given commanding prominence, for when once the public have fully grasped their import, the problem will be solved and the victory won :

First. The American people must know that the essential requisite of our currency is not volume, but soundness ; and

Second. They must cease looking to Congress in every season of financial distress for relief, but instead become more self-reliant, more self-helpful, and learn to employ to a greater extent the means locally at hand.

A careful study of the monetary history of recent years, both in proposed and enacted legislation, reveals the dominant idea to have been the increase in the volume of the currency ; and so strenuously have the advocates of a great volume of circulating medium urged the matter that a distinguished writer upon economic subjects propounds the query :

"Has there been a year since 1868 when the industrial interests of this country have not perceptibly flinched before the threat of inflation? Has Congress, since the volume of money became a political issue, ever opened in December without an evident dread on the part of the mercantile and manufacturing community lest unwise and fanatical legislation should follow?"

To such lengths has this view been pushed that the soundness of our money, its absolute stability, its intrinsic or representative value, its ability to pass current without question in all the markets of the world, its entrenchment in the confidence of the people, have been by many considered scarcely of even secondary importance. There never was a more fallacious doctrine taught than that the prosperity of a people depends upon, or is gained by, the great volume of its currency, irrespective of other conditions. It is the echo of the long-since exploded theory that only money is wealth, and the greater the volume of it the richer the people. It reigned supreme in France in the days of John Law and his "Mississippi River Bubble" scheme, and again when the National Assembly of France, seventy-five years later issued mil-

lions upon millions of assignats and mandates. The early history of the Colonies of New England, with the issues of the Land Bank of Massachusetts and those of the Paper Bank of Rhode Island, is a fruitful source of instruction to all who cling so tenaciously to the prime necessity of great volume, while much knowledge can be gained from contemplating the issues of the United Colonies under the Articles of Confederation, and still later by the banks of the North, South, East, and West prior to the civil war. And still more instructive is the experience of the Argentine Republic in giving way to such theory, the resultant effect of which is a nation of bankrupts. It is not the quantity of our currency, but the quality and efficiency of it, which are most deserving of attention and which most affect the national prosperity of the American people. If every dollar which we circulate is worth a dollar at home or abroad, there need be little fear of an insufficient quantity. If it is not, enlarging the volume but insures a wider sweep of financial ruin.

No matter how great or how small the volume, there will always be sections of the country where, under the same conditions, money famine will prevail. Legislation is powerless to remedy this or put an end to it, and the sooner this fact is realized the sooner will the people of these sections set about to create conditions which will bring to them at any and all seasons of the year such amounts of money as will best meet their needs. "The want of money," as it is called, says Gallatin, "is the want of exchangeable or salable property or commodities and the want of credit. *The man who says that he wants money could at all times obtain it if he had either credit or salable commodities.*" It is the failure to appreciate that it is want of credit on the part of the borrower, and not a want of currency in the country, which causes an appeal to Congress to do that through legislative enactment which only can be accomplished through individual or local exertion.

The same amount of energy and industry which is now employed in attempting to demonstrate the great boon which is conferred upon communities by great issues of currency, directed toward convincing the people that they can do more through employing means which they already have at hand, if properly understood, to relieve themselves from embarrassment than Congress possibly can do for them, would accomplish more substantial

benefit. Currency becomes efficient to the extent that it passes rapidly from hand to hand and to the extent it discharges the largest number of different obligations. With better banking facilities the country over, better supported and more largely patronized, the complaint now so frequently heard of the scarcity of currency would no longer be made, the use of it greatly economized, and its efficiency enhanced. To do all this, it is not necessary to have banks of issue, but well-conducted banks of deposit and discount, for through the general utilizing of the instrumentalities afforded by them—"bills, checks, and other machinery will perform," as Professor Bonamy Price says, "all the additional work." He further adds :

"The quantity of notes or coin in circulation is related solely to those particular payments in which these tools are used; and the number of transactions employing these tools is more of a habit than anything else. *Ready money payments would multiply their use; an extension of banking would diminish it.*"

It is from this source that avoidance of periods of money scarcity must largely come, and not from continual increase in currency issues. The success of the Scotch bank system in meeting at all times the needs of the Scotch people has arisen more from the fact that it is the universal practice of the Scotch of even the most moderate means to lodge their money with the banks than from the volume or the manner of issuing it. They thus make every dollar an efficient agency in supporting the larger volume of transactions which are carried on through other instruments of trade and credit. In this country, while the aggregate number of persons who thus patronize the banks of the country seems large, the actual number in each community is comparatively small, and, in consequence, much of the actual money of the country fails to perform the beneficial service which it would if once directed into proper channels.

When the American people call into use, to the extent that the best business methods require, the aid which good banks can afford, Congress will be relieved from the recurring importunity to increase the volume of the circulating medium irrespective of its stability, the cry for more money will cease, each community will, in the greatest measure, contribute to relieving its own distresses, and the financial vagaries of inflationists no longer continue to plague our world of business and of politics.

JAMES H. ECKELS.

THE HAWAIIAN QUESTION.

BY FREDERIC R. COUDERT.

THE question of Hawaii is fast reaching the condition of the Schleswig-Holstein problem. Every day that passes by adds to the difficulty of understanding the facts and of applying the law. It is dim, vague, and shadowy in its outline, uncertain in much of its evidence, complicated with partisan prepossessions and moulded to fit partisan opinions. The testimony has become so voluminous and confused as to discourage study and repel curiosity, so that the average citizen is disposed to vote the whole business a bore and to mourn the day when the United States soldiers first put their foot upon Hawaiian soil. Whatever may be the sentimental preference of our people for a republican form of government, most of them are disposed to live in peace and comfort, even if Hawaii should be deprived of the inestimable blessings of democratic rule. But then the question will not be put down without a struggle, for it involves us, our interests, and our honor. Study it we must, and it may be of use to the readers of the REVIEW to have a brief statement of the controversy made for them. There is, we need not say, a serious question of international law involved. That question, like every other, has two sides, the right side and the wrong side. Let us try to have it settled right.

The Hawaiian difficulty, be it remembered, is an inheritance. The present administration did not originate it and has thus far done nothing to aggravate the evils of the legacy, unless, indeed, its very wise course in refusing to jump into the perils and absurdity of annexing the Hawaiian Islands to the United States be considered such an aggravation. Nor has the administration established or sought to establish any new and startling theory of international law. It has labored to assert, at the outset, the

wise and wholesome principles which it has been our policy as a government to observe from the beginning ; the only principles which will permit us to escape the perils of international collision and at the same time to give due protection to our citizens whenever and wherever that protection may be needed.

Secretary Gresham's instructions to Mr. Blount when the latter started upon his mission to Honolulu defined the position of the administration in apt and concise language :

" Historical precedents and the general course of the United States authorize the employment of its armed force in foreign territory for the security of the lives and property of American citizens and for the repression of lawless and tumultuous acts threatening them ; and the powers conferred to that end upon the representatives of the United States are both necessary and proper, subject always to the exercise of a sound discretion in their application.

" In the judgment of the President, your authority, as well as that of the commander of the naval forces in Hawaiian waters, should be and is limited in the use of physical force to such measures as are necessary to protect the persons and property of our citizens, and while abstaining from any manner of interference with the domestic concerns of the islands, you should indicate your willingness to intervene with your friendly offices in the interests of a peaceful settlement of troubles within the limits of sound discretion.

" Should it be necessary to land an armed force upon the Hawaiian territory on occasions of popular disturbance, when the local authority may be unable to give adequate protection to the life and property of citizens of the United States, the assent of such authority should first be obtained if it can be done without prejudice to the interests involved."

The position here taken is important in a double aspect : First, because it clearly states the views of our government as to its right to interfere in the concerns of another people, next, because the rules here laid down may serve as a test when we undertake to decide to what extent, if any, the late administration has violated rules of international obligation, as that obligation is viewed by the executive power now in office. It is plain that if Minister Stevens did nothing more and nothing else than Secretary Gresham authorized Mr. Blount to do, any criticism of the course pursued by Minister Stevens is ill-timed and unfounded.

It is claimed, however, and a mass of evidence is adduced to prove, that Minister Stevens did not confine himself to the simple and obvious duties thus conceded to be properly within his sphere, but that, on the contrary, he used his great power as the representative of the United States to precipitate the downfall of the existing government. It is insisted that, without

the aid which he afforded to the insurgents, the revolution could never have succeeded, nay, would not have been attempted; that the bayonets of the United States soldiers virtually terrified the Queen into submission and compelled her to resign. If these charges are made out, the result would seem to be plain, viz.: That an injustice having been done by the abuse of our representative's authority, it is incumbent upon us, so far as practicable, to redress the wrong done. As the only way to accomplish this is to restore the *status quo*, justice and self-respect concur to make an attempt, at least, at restitution.

It is plain, at the outset, that whatever Minister Stevens may have intended, thought, or designed, the promoters of the insurrection, when they appealed to him for aid and comfort, were not limited in their action by the lines set out in Secretary Gresham's subsequent instructions to Mr. Blount. It did not occur to them that the United States Government was only bound to protect its own citizens, nor did they believe that their appeal, to be effectual, must be based upon some threatened or actual injury to American interests. It is obvious that they called upon the government of the United States very much as the bemired traveller called upon Hercules to extract his cart from an impassable road. They knew the physical power of our nation, and could well imagine that the moral force of our flag, backed up even by an insignificant number of bayonets, would be omnipotent in the destruction or the creation of a government at Honolulu. And, therefore, when they wrote under date of January 16, 1893, to Minister Stevens, they respectfully reported that the Queen was misbehaving herself, that the public safety was menaced, that lives and property were imperilled; on these grounds they appealed to the United States forces and to him for assistance. A pettifogging lawyer would have been disposed to interpose a demurrer, as there certainly were not facts enough on their own showing to justify the forcible interference of the United States. There was no pretence that the property of our citizens was imperilled or their lives endangered; nor did it appear that the petitioners were Americans; in fact the majority of the signers were not.

But the embryonic insurrectionists went on to state their grievance, viz.: That the Queen, "with the aid of armed force and with threats of violence and bloodshed from those with whom she was acting," *attempted to proclaim a new constitution*; and

while *prevented*, for the time, from accomplishing her object, “*declared publicly that she would only defer her action!*” This conduct and action, it was insisted, had created general alarm and terror, and the signers who had constituted themselves into a Citizens’ Committee of Safety, declared that they were unable to protect themselves without aid; they, *therefore*, prayed for the protection of the United States forces. Any one disposed to criticism would naturally suggest that if the Queen had only *attempted to proclaim* a new constitution, but had been *prevented* from accomplishing her object, there was no real ground for the interference of the United States forces or of any one else. A public declaration that she would *defer her action*, so far from inviting forcible interference, should rather have been considered a reason for leaving her some room for penitence, with the hope that her action would be “deferred” indefinitely. Besides, how do we know that the new constitution was worse than the one under which the inhabitants were living and that great wrongs would be done to our minister’s protégés?

It is certain that this request of the Committee of Safety reached the American minister. It is certain that the troops were landed, and it is equally sure that the Queen yielded up her authority, protesting in the most solemn manner that she yielded only to the superior force of the United States of America, whose Minister, Mr. Stevens, she said, had “caused United States troops to be landed at Honolulu, and declared that he would support the said provisional government.” It is stated, in defence of Mr. Stevens, that he only consented to administer forcible remedies for the constitutional ailments of the Hawaiians *after* the government *de facto* had been established. It requires some effort to consider this seriously upon the evidence in the case. But let us glance for a moment at the dates. The call on the American Minister was made on January 16, 1893. On the 17th—that is, *the next day*—the insurrectionists had made such progress as to be fully established and to be entitled to recognition as a provisional government! “About 4 to 5 P. M. of this date—am not certain of the precise time—” says Mr. Stevens *under date of January 17, 1893*, “I addressed a short note to Hon. Samuel Parker, Hon. William H. Cornwell, Hon. John F. Colburn, and Hon. A. P. Peterson, no longer regarding them as ministers, informing them that *I had recognized*

the provisional government." It is plain, therefore, that at some time before 4 o'clock, on the 17th of January, Mr. Stevens had, of his own motion, dismissed Messrs. Parker and others from their office and notified them that he had recognized the provisional government. And what makes this the more remarkable, and, indeed, renders the prompt success of the insurgents inexplicable, is, as we have seen, that they themselves had declared in their letter *that they were unable to protect themselves without aid, and for that reason* prayed for the protection of the United States forces. The exercise of common reasoning powers and the injection of common-sense into discussion are not inhibited, even where grave diplomatic questions are concerned. Is it probable—we might almost ask, Is it possible?—that these men, knowing their own inability to protect themselves without aid and looking for protection only to the United States forces, could have succeeded in subverting the government in these few hours unless they had, *at least*, the assurance of aid and encouragement from Mr. Stevens? That the action of Mr. Stevens, or at least his purpose, was well known at an early hour on January 17th is plain, from the fact that the Queen's abdication was made on the same day, January 17, 1893, and that in the instrument of resignation she recites that Mr. Stevens had already caused United States troops to be landed at Honolulu and declared that he would support the said provisional government.

Mr. Charles L. Carter, who visited the United States soon after the revolution, in the interests of the provisional government, is very wroth at Her Majesty for this ill-timed proclamation. Evidently, in his mind, it would have been more decorous for her to wait until all these minor matters had been settled to the satisfaction of Mr. Stevens and the provisional government. He says that the Queen's protest was a "quibbling trick," which now makes clear to many of us what we then considered her "cowardly surrender." Independently of the fact that this sentence is unintelligible, for a "quibbling trick" is not apt to "make clear a cowardly surrender," it does seem unfair to her to use these hard words where her conduct was so obviously proper and natural. But he pours out a good deal more strong language upon her unprotected head and upon those who ventured to stand by her and to aid and abet her in her disaster. They were "tricksters," they

incorporated "a wanton lie," but "that lie did not act as an estoppel," and he winds up with the pregnant information to the secretary that "national affairs are not controlled as litigations in courts of law." Unfortunately, this is true. National affairs are not always controlled by sound rules of justice and of truth. The weak are not always protected; the strong are not always forbearing and prudent. Judgment does not always follow justice. Mr. Carter is, no doubt, a very able and intelligent man, whose character, so far as we know, is unimpeached and unimpeachable, but his defence of Mr. Stevens and the insurrectionists would have been quite as strong if he had said less about the tricksters and their wanton lies, and had more clearly demonstrated "the mighty truth that inspired the course" of the insurrectionists.

One of the points most hotly contended for by the defenders of Mr. Stevens is that he only gave his recognition of the provisional government, as the *de facto* government of the islands, *after* the Committee of Public Safety had taken possession of the government buildings, archives, and treasury, and *after* the provisional government had been installed at the heads of these respective departments. Possibly this may be true, although very strong evidence to the contrary is offered. It is possible that Mr. Stevens may have actually deferred recognition of the provisional government until such occupation of the public buildings, but that does not seem to be the only, or indeed the important, question in the case. If by his action he coerced the feeble administration of the Queen to yield up its power and to succumb before the authority of the United States, then to argue that he should escape criticism because of this delay is simply pettifogging. The expression may be harsh, but it is the only proper one. The truth seems to be that he had arranged the matters with the insurrectionists; that he had given them his promise; that the soldiers had been landed; that the moral forces at his command were used and the physical forces held ready for action, and when, under these combined influences, the government resigned, he appeared for the first time formally to recognize an administration of his own creation. But even this attempt at palliation is disposed of by Judge Dole, a gentleman in whom Mr. Stevens places the highest confidence and whose veracity he must be the last man in the

world to impeach. Judge Dole writes on January 17, 1893, *the very day* on which Mr. Stevens had refused any longer to regard Messrs. Parker and others as ministers, and says :

"I acknowledge receipt of your valued communication of this day recognizing the Hawaiian provisional government, and express deep appreciation of the same. We have conferred with the ministers of the late government, and have made demand upon the marshal to surrender the station-house. We are not actually yet in possession of the station-house ; but as night is approaching, and our forces may be insufficient to maintain order, we request the immediate support of the United States forces." etc.

We must leave this highly respectable man, Judge Dole, to reconcile his statement with Mr. Stevens' declaration. If Judge Dole was telling the truth, at a time when there was no reason why he should dissemble or disregard it, he was *not* in possession of the station-house *at the time when he was thanking Mr. Stevens for his recognition of the provisional government*. Until these two gentlemen have settled this question, it must be assumed, with all the probabilities in favor of the assumption, that Mr. Stevens had actually, as he certainly had in intent, promoted, encouraged, aided, and abetted the insurrection.

The downfall of the monarchy may or may not be a desirable event ; the Queen may or may not be what her enemies charge ; Judge Dole and his associates may absorb in themselves all the cardinal and other virtues, but it is difficult for an impartial man to escape the conviction that whatever good, whatever credit, and whatever praise may attach to the downfall of Queen Liliuokalani belongs mainly to Mr. Stevens. Judge Dole and other excellent gentlemen may have a just claim to a small part of the success, but the chief actor is undoubtedly Mr. Stevens. Truly *he* did it; and if it be part of the occupation of United States envoys to act the part of international Don Quixotes, to use their office and their power to subvert governments that do not suit their tastes, and to arrange new establishments more to their own liking, he has earned the gratitude of his countrymen. In the mean while his zealous efforts have made it imperative upon our people to decide how far they will ratify his acts, thereby establishing precedents which are very sure, if followed, to relieve our international relations from the reproach of being tame or monotonous.

F. R. COUDERT.

THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL AND MODERN BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

BY THE REV. CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D. D.

THE Sunday-school is a modern institution, springing up as one of the fruits of that revival of religion in Great Britain and America which is called Methodism. The origin of the modern Sunday-school is generally found in the efforts of Robert Raikes, at Gloucester, England, in 1780. Long prior to this, schools of various kinds for the religious instruction of children on Sunday had been in operation in England, Scotland, Germany, Bohemia, and especially in Milan, where the pious Archbishop Charles Borromeo had established them in the middle of the sixteenth century. But these were local or provisional enterprises. The effort of Raikes was the beginning of a world-wide movement. It is interesting to note that Eichhorn, the father of the Higher Criticism of Holy Scripture, published the first edition of his *Introduction to the Old Testament* in 1780. The work of Eichhorn was also preceded by the preparatory labors of Herder, Astruc, Lowth, Simon, and other investigators. These two great movements of our age, the practical movement of the Sunday-school and the scholarly movement of the Higher Criticism, beginning in the very same year, the one in the heart of England, the other in the heart of Germany, have pursued each its independent course, each thriving chiefly in the land of its birth; but now at last the two movements have come together, and it has become a burning question, What shall be the relation between them?

The Sunday-school has as its aim to give religious instruction, primarily in Holy Scripture; secondarily, in the Catechisms of the Church. The primary aim of the Sunday-school cannot be accomplished without the aid of Biblical Criticism, for Biblical

Criticism searches Holy Scripture in order to test its truths and facts, to verify them, and to discriminate between them and the theories which have been formulated about them. Biblical Criticism brings the student near to the original Bible, so that it becomes more real, more vivid, more lively, and so more impressive and attractive. These are the very qualities of the Bible which enable the Sunday-school teacher to understand it, and which impart to him the ability to teach it to his scholars. The harmonious combination of these two great enterprises of our century will accomplish an enormous gain for the study of the Bible in the Christian Church.

For nearly eighteen centuries the Christian Church marched through history winning its greatest triumphs without the help of the Sunday-school. It accomplished the most essential parts of the work of the Sunday-school by catechetical schools of various kinds conducted by pastors and their helpers. These catechetical schools date from the beginnings of the Christian Church ; they were involved in the Christian sacraments of Holy Baptism and the Holy Eucharist, and the training necessary for participation in them. It was largely owing to the multiplication of sects in Great Britain and America and the immense numbers of children who were brought up by their parents without baptism and entirely apart from churchly influences that made the Sunday-school a necessity. The need of the Sunday-school has not been so great in those countries where there are few if any dissenting sects and where all the children are baptized and are expected at the proper time to undergo the training necessary for confirmation.

The usefulness of the Sunday-school is also involved in the question of religious education in the Common School. On the continent of Europe, in most countries, religious instruction is given in the national schools, or in parochial schools. Under these circumstances Sunday-schools have little place. But in the United States of America, where religious instruction is banished from the common schools, where else shall the religious instruction be imparted to the children who attend the common schools unless in the Sunday-school ?

The American Sunday-school has, in most cases, to comprehend all the problems of religious instruction that are involved [1] in the daily religious instruction of parochial schools and of

VOL. CLVIII.—NO. 446. 5

the national schools of Europe ; [2] in the catechetical training for confirmation ; [3] in the special work of the Sunday-school itself. All of these great tasks are to be accomplished in the American Sunday-school in the limited time of one hour on Sundays. The American Sunday-school does not succeed in these tasks. It cannot. Practically it limits itself in most cases to its own special work. That is the reason why wise pastors insist upon having catechetical classes of their own. That is the reason why thinking men of other denominations than the Roman Catholic are urging that in some way religious instruction should be given in common schools.

The teachers of parochial schools and of national schools are well trained. They are required to undertake special preparatory studies, and to sustain examinations which will qualify them and accredit them as competent teachers. The classes in preparation for confirmation are ordinarily conducted by thoroughly educated pastors. But the teachers of Sunday-schools are commonly pious young people who have had little, if any, training in the art of teaching or in Biblical study or in the doctrines or customs of their Church, and whose qualifications have not been tested by examinations. The actual situation is that for five days of the week the children are taught by experienced, well-trained, and approved teachers in all the common studies of our schools ; but on Sunday they are taught for a single hour, too often by inexperienced and untrained teachers, in the most sacred matters of our holy religion. Many efforts have been made by earnest Sunday-school workers to give teachers the preparation which they need to meet their classes ; but this can be accomplished only by a comprehensive and thorough enterprise conducted on sound principles of education. The most hopeful movement in recent times is the organization of the Bible Study Union to encourage the use of the Blakeslee Graded Lessons. The difficulty of the situation is that the most of the lesson helps, which have been examined by the writer, contain a large amount of crude, undigested material ; good, bad, and indifferent statements mingled without discrimination ; traditional opinions, speculative apologetics, and mere guesses, presented as if they were the truth of God ; anything and everything which may be used for illustrating the lesson, with indifference whether it corresponds with truth or fact. If such rubbish is to be taught in the American

Sunday-school the word of God contained in Holy Scripture will hardly emerge through it.

The International Lessons for 1894, used in the most of the American Sunday-schools, cover ground which, more than any other, comes into relation with modern Biblical criticism. The lessons for the first half of the year are in the books of Genesis and Exodus; for the second half of the year in the Gospels. These come in contact with the Lower Criticism, the Higher Criticism, Historical Criticism, and Biblical Theology. It is difficult to see how any except teachers in the more elementary classes can avoid these departments of criticism. It is doubtful whether this selection of lessons was wise in view of the great agitation of the public mind of several denominations about Biblical criticism. It is doubtful whether the attention of all Sunday-school teachers and children should have been called to these questions in the most difficult of all fields, for the next six months. But it is now too late for doubts and regrets. The American Sunday-school is now obliged to face the questions of Biblical criticism.

1. Textual criticism has to determine, by the study of manuscripts, versions, citations, and the laws of transmission, what was the exact original text of Holy Scripture. The Sunday-school depends upon translations from the original text. Which translation shall be followed, the Common Version or the Revised Version? or shall the teacher and student compare the two and make his choice between them? Shall he take into consideration the readings of the ancient versions given in the margin of the Revised Version or refuse to consider them? Shall he take account of the readings suggested by the best modern critics as carefully collected in the Variorum Bible? Just as soon as the teacher or scholar deviates in any respect from the Common Version, he, to the extent of his deviations, enters into the work of Textual Criticism. If he is not content to rest on the Common Version, is he competent to decide himself between the two versions without evidence? He must, therefore, in all honesty, go to the margin of the Revised Version; he will act wisely if he resort to the Variorum Bible, where the names of the principal authorities are given for every variation, and there is room for discrimination.

2. The higher criticism has to determine these four questions:

(a) The integrity; (b) the authenticity; (c) the literary style; and (d), the credibility of the writing. It is difficult to see how these questions can be avoided in the study of Genesis and Exodus.

(a) Who wrote Genesis and Exodus? This question will be asked in the American Sunday-schools this coming year as never before. The lesson helps, many of them, state the traditional opinion that Moses wrote these books, without modification. Some state that Moses used older documents and so compiled the books. But other lesson helps recognize that Biblical criticism has shown that Moses did not write these books and that the author is unknown. The teachers and scholars will often be perplexed by this difference of opinion. When they turn away from their lesson helps to the larger works upon the Bible, they will see that Biblical critics are practically unanimous in their opinions on this question. It matters little if a few American professors, in theological seminaries renowned for their extreme conservatism, hold the traditional opinion, when the majority of American Biblical scholars agree with all the professional teachers of the Old Testament in all the universities of Protestant Europe that Moses did not write Genesis or Exodus. The student turns to the *Encyclopædia Britannica* and to the new edition of Smith's *Biblical Dictionary* and to the *Cambridge Bible for Sunday-schools* and to the *Commentaries* and critical works of the most famous scholars of modern Europe, and finds them all agreeing that Moses did not write the books of Genesis and Exodus. If the Sunday-school teachers are content to state the facts, that the traditional opinion is that Moses wrote the Pentateuch; that modern criticism holds that he did not write these books; but that the question is unimportant for the religious lessons of these books; he may reserve his own opinion and that of his scholars with safety. But if he undertakes a polemic against Modern Criticism in the interests of the traditional theory, and makes the question a test of orthodoxy, the divisions and heartburning which are among the ministers will arise among the Sunday-school teachers and scholars; and if he should pursue the unwise course commended by some ultra-conservative teachers and maintain that if Moses did not write Genesis it cannot be inspired, it is altogether probable that not a few teachers and scholars may be forced into a dilemma and be compelled to give up the inspiration of the book. There is no danger of this in those parts of our country where

Biblical criticism is known and valued. The peril will arise in reactionary schools where ultra-conservatism prevails.

(*b*) The Sunday-school teacher will be unable to avoid the question of the integrity of the book of Genesis. The question is raised in many of the lesson helps. It matters little that the most of them raise the question of earlier documents in order to deny them. The teachers and scholars will examine into this matter for themselves. They will see that the documentary theory is recognized as the established doctrine of criticism in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible and in the Cambridge Bible for Sunday-Schools. Some of them will look at the documents as they are separated by Driver, Bacon, Harper, and others, and they will decide for themselves.

It is noteworthy that the International Lessons for 1894 seem to have been chosen with the analysis of Driver in view. There are three documents in Genesis: The Ephraimitic document (*E*), written in the northern kingdom of Samaria; the Judaic document (*J*), written in the southern kingdom of Judah, and the later priestly document (*P*). We give in parallel columns the selections from Genesis and the corresponding ones from the Gospels in order to show that, consciously or unconsciously, the compilers of these lessons have selected from the different documents of the Pentateuch very much in the same way as they have selected from the four Gospels.

Gen. I. 26-31.; II. 1-3. P.	Luke II. 1-16.
" III. 1-15 J.	Luke II. 25-38.
" IV. 3-13 J.	Matthew II. 1-12.
" IX. 8-17 P.	Matthew II. 13-23.
" XII. 1-9 J [except 4 b-5 P].	Luke II. 40-52.
" XVII. 1-9 P.	Mark I. 1-11.
" XVIII. 22-33 J.	Matthew IV., 1-11.
" XXII. 1-13 E.	John I. 35-49.
" XXV. 27-34 J.	John II. 1-11.
" XXVIII. 10-22 J E [mixed].	John II. 13-25.
" XXXII. 9-12, 24-30 J.	Luke IV. 16-30.
" XXXVII. 1-11 E [except 1-2 a P.]	Luke V. 1-11.
" XXXVII. 23-36 J E [mixed].	Mark I. 21-34.
" XLI. 38-48 E [except 46 P].	Mark II. 1-12.
" XLV. 1-15 E.	Mark II. 23-28; III. 1-5.
" L. 14-26 E. [except 14 J].	Mark III. 6-19.

Only two of these passages from Genesis contain a mixed text—XXVIII. 10-22 and XXXVII. 23-36—where *J* and *E* are mingled. In XXXVII. 1-11, L. 14-26, the opening verses came from another document. But these were used because necessary to the connection. In XII. 1-9 and XLI. 38-48, historic inser-

tions from *P* are used because it would be difficult to leave them out. The lessons, therefore, give specimens from the documents fairly well in accordance with Driver's Analysis. From Matthew three passages are given; from the priestly document, three; from Mark and Luke, five passages each; from *J*, six passages, and from *E*, five passages; from John, three passages; from the mixed text of *J E*, two passages. A careful reader of the English versions will note differences which shine through these various documents, and these differences will be as striking in the documents of Genesis as in the documents of the Gospel.

(c) The literary style of the story of Genesis cannot be altogether ignored. The question will often be asked in the Sunday-schools whether the earlier chapters of Genesis are real historical narratives or whether they contain historic facts embellished by legend, myth, or tradition; whether the poetic imagination is chiefly responsible for the story of creation and of paradise, and of the antediluvians and patriarchs, endeavoring to teach the most important lessons of the origin of the world, of man, and of sin, in beautiful pictures which are easily understood; or whether the logical faculty gives exact reproductions of the truths and facts imparted by divine revelation or derived from human authorities. The question will also be raised whether the authors use the style of historical prose, or of lyric, epic, or didactic poetry. It may not be easy to answer any of these questions with sufficient decision to give satisfaction to the inquiring mind. If, however, the teacher can show to the scholar that these questions have only to do with the literary form of the documents, and that the religious instruction contained in them is independent of the literary form, he will concentrate attention upon the religious instruction of these early books of Holy Scripture, and derive from them the lessons which the Sunday-school ought chiefly to learn.

(d) The most serious question the Sunday-school will have to confront is the question of credibility. This question depends to a large extent upon the other questions which have been considered. The Sunday-school teacher should be careful lest he risk the credibility of Genesis with the assertion of its Mosaic authorship. He should teach that many of the best modern critics deny the Mosaic authorship of Genesis and yet maintain its credibility. It is not so clear that the name of Moses is a better attestation for the credibility of Gene-

sis than the anonymous writers of later times; for the final compiler of Genesis used three great original documents and compacted them together. These three documents are three independent witnesses who themselves used older documents and sources for their authority. Marshall's *Life of Washington* is by no means so credible an authority as Bancroft's *History of the United States*; for though Marshall is much nearer to the events, he had not such extensive sources of information and he lacked the critical sagacity and historic skill of Bancroft. We have evidence that Moses was a prophet and a lawgiver, but what evidence have we that he was an historian?

The question of credibility depends still more upon the literary form of the narrative. If it should be maintained that the story of the Creation and the Fall are plain historical narratives, and that therefore we must believe that God created the world in six days of twenty-four hours, and that He then rested on the seventh day and consecrated it to be the Sabbath of rest from that time onward; and that an animal serpent conversed with Eve and seduced her to eat of a forbidden fruit and so introduced sin and death into the world; then it will be exceedingly difficult to convince many of the Sunday-school teachers and scholars that these narratives are altogether credible. If it should be said that there has been some poetic embellishment of these stories; that the days are periods and that the rest of God from further creation in the seventh period is the basis for the subsequent establishment of the weekly sabbath; that the serpent was really an evil spirit, the devil, and that it was not so much the fruit of the tree as the disobedience and lack of faith in God that brought sin and evil into the world; then the narrative becomes more credible in some respects; but at the expense of its consistency and harmony. If these stories are regarded as works of the imagination, poetic in structure and poetic in conception; if the days are simply the framework to set forth the general orderliness and progressiveness of the creation; the seventh day the appended conception of a later prose writer using the poem of the creation as the basis for the sabbath of the priestly law; if the story of the serpent and the tree are poetical pictures of that mysterious event, the first entrance of sin into the world; then the great spiritual lessons of the creation and the original sin of man stand out in attractive beauty and power and bear witness to their own credibility. It is

really immaterial to these religious lessons how far the poetical embellishment of the stories may extend or how far it may be in accord with the actual facts of the case.

3. Historical criticism will meet the Sunday-school teacher in his study of the books of Genesis and Exodus. The lessons have been selected apparently with great skill, so as to avoid as many such questions as possible. This gives them the appearance of a hop, skip, and jump over chapters and verses in their course through the book of Genesis. But it is difficult to see how it is possible to avoid taking the neglected passages into consideration. The lesson on the creation is limited to the creation of man and the resting on the seventh day, and thus the most of the questions which spring up in the early chapters of Genesis in connection with modern science are avoided. The story of the deluge is passed over. The only reference to it is in connection with the Covenant with Noah. The Dispersion of the Nations is omitted. The selections from the story of Abraham and Jacob are those which come least into contact with external history. In the story of Joseph the one document *E* is closely adhered to, and in the story of the Exodus there seems to be a careful avoidance of difficulties. Nevertheless historical criticism must be faced in many of the passages.

(a) The story of the institution of the Passover in these lessons is taken from the story of *P* in Ex. XII., 1-14. But the parallel story of *J* is given in Ex. XII. 21-27, and is much simpler and more primitive in conception. It seems that the story of *P* has mingled with its narrative the more complex legislation of later times. This is confirmed by a study of the law codes where there are five different laws respecting the Passover showing development through the different codes: (1) Ex. XXIII. 18 *E*. (2) Ex. XXXIV. 25. *J*. (3) Deut. XVI. 2-7 *D*. (4) Num. IX. 12 *P a*. (5) Num. XXVIII. 16 *P b*. The narrative of *J* corresponds with the earlier code of *J*, the narrative of *P* with the later code of *P*.

(b) The story of the crossing of the Red Sea is given in Ex. XIV. 19-29, in which *E J* and *P* are all mingled in the compiled narrative of the final editor. The Song, Ex. XV., gives another poetic version of the story. There are several references to it in the Psalter and in the Prophets. A comparison of the different Hebrew representations gives a varied and complex

conception. It is not our purpose to distinguish here between the historical nucleus and the varied poetical embellishments or to urge the Sunday-school teacher and scholar to undertake this difficult task. There is a certain advantage in such an undertaking, because it enables the scholar to distinguish between the real and the ideal in Biblical history, and cautions him against the besetting sin in practical interpretation of exaggerating the importance of trivial and unimportant accessories to the neglect of the essential features of the narrative. But we have called attention to this lesson because it comes in contact with historical geography. The lesson omits the references to historic places in the previous context and limits our attention to the scene of crossing the Red Sea itself. It is probable that its northern arm in ancient times extended farther to the north than at present, and eminent authorities think that it included also the Bitter Lakes. But there is no agreement as to place of passage. It was probably a little below Suez, but several other places are contended for by scholars who are entitled to a hearing.

(c) Egyptian archæology sheds light upon the lesson, Ex. I. 1-14, with reference to the bondage of Israel in Egypt, through the recent investigation of the buried treasure cities upon which the Hebrews labored. But the lesson carefully avoids raising the difficult historical question of the length of the sojourn in Egypt and the date of the Exodus. Teachers and scholars may make an excursion into these regions of historical criticism, but they are not called so to do, and it would seem to be best to adhere to the path of religious instruction which has been marked out for them.

4. The International Lessons from Genesis raise some of the most difficult questions in Biblical Theology. These lessons spring out of the passages in their order. It is evident that there is a very great disproportion in the importance of the religious instruction given in these lessons. A glance at the following table will suffice :

[1] The creation of man and the seventh day's rest. Gen. I. 26-II., 3.	[1] Discord in Jacob's family. XXXVII. 1-11.
[2] The original sin and the original promise. Gen. III. 1-15.	[2] Joseph sold into Egypt. XXXVII. 23-36.
[3] The origin of sacrifice, and the fratricide. IV. 3-13.	[3] Joseph ruler in Egypt. XLI. 38-48.
[4] The covenant with Noah. IX., 8-17.	[4] Joseph forgiving his brethren. XLV. 1-15.
[5] The call and migration of Abram. XII. 1-9.	[5] Joseph's last days. L. 14-26.

Either more than five lessons should be given to the study of the first group of topics, or five lessons are too many for the relative importance of the second group. It may be that this disproportion inheres in any use of lessons from Holy Scripture itself. If this be so, it affords a strong argument in favor of textbooks for a harmonious and well-proportioned study of Biblical history and Biblical doctrine. But this difficulty might have been overcome, in a measure at least, by a larger and more detailed study of the twelve earlier chapters of Genesis. This would have been more profitable than such a hasty study of the fundamental facts of our holy religion. It was not necessary to append the question of the Sabbath to the study of the creation of man. There is peril lest the more practical question of the observance of the Sabbath may crowd the vastly more important doctrine of the creation of man. It would have been wiser to make two lessons out of the second, the one on the original sin, the other on the protevangelium, and even then the themes would be too vast for one hour of study.

The doctrine of the creation of man in the lesson from the first chapter of Genesis can hardly be successfully considered without the study of the creative acts of the previous days of creation; and certainly the story of the second chapter of Genesis will have to be studied likewise. The differences are here on the surface. In the one story mankind is created as a race, male and female, on the sixth day before the seventh day of rest dawns; in the other there is a long series of divine and human activities separated by events of transcendent importance, before the human race was produced. In the one story God creates by saying as a sovereign and commander; in the other he uses his hands and the breath of his nostrils as a workman and a benefactor. In the one story God blesses the race and assigns mankind his dominion and destiny; in the other God trains the man, the woman, and their children by personal, visible, and audible presence. In the one story man bears the image of God, and therefore is sovereign of nature; in the other, man's body is made of dust and his spirit of the breath of God; but inasmuch as the animals were made in the same way, the difference first appears by experiment when no helpmeet is found for the man from among the animals. When now to these differences is added different names of God, different terms for the vegetation and the animals,

and even for the two sexes of mankind, it is abundantly evident that we have two different stories and two different conceptions and representations of the creation of our race. If now the teacher can grasp the significance of these facts and apprehend that the mode of the creation of man is of small importance compared with the creation itself; if he has the discernment to see that the mode of the creation was not revealed to man by God; but was represented by different poets as they were enabled by the divine spirit to construct it by the use of their imagination and that these are pictorial representations of a divine act which could not be represented or described in its mysterious and unknowable reality, and that through these varied poetic embellishments the same essential doctrine shines; then the religious instruction, that man was created by God as the crown of nature, as the ruler of nature, and as the image and representative of God in person, character, activity, and entire life, will impress itself upon the scholars and teachers with freshness, vividness, and redemptive power. If modern science can give us a better description of the creation of man than the Hebrew poets, what matters it? They cannot give us any truer doctrine of the creation or of the relation of man to God and to nature than that given us in the early chapters of Genesis. If any one insists upon the mode of creation of the first chapter of Genesis, he will come in conflict with the mode of creation of the second chapter of Genesis, and either of them will bring him in conflict with the sure results of modern science. And if he insists upon the literal verbal representations what can he do with other parts of Holy Scripture such as Psalms XXXIII. and CIV., which give still other varying pictures of the creation, and with Proverbs VIII., Job XXXVIII., Amos IX., Isaiah XL? If he insists upon it that the body of man was formed by God and his spirit inbreathed, how will he meet the objection from Zechariah XII. 1 where it is said that Yahweh "formeth the spirit of man within him"; and from Psalm XXXIII. 6, where all the hosts of heaven were made "by the breath of his mouth"; and from Psalm VIII. 3, where the heavens are the work of God's fingers; and from Ps. XIX. 1, where "the firmament sheweth his handiwork"? There are those who think that they can build a doctrine of creation out of a prosaic interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis. They can do it only by shutting their eyes to the great variety of beautiful images under

which the creation of man and nature is taught, in many different passages of Scripture. There is only one way to reach a sound and reliable doctrine, and that is to seek for the essential instruction which underlies all these images, and beware lest we become absorbed in the coloring and trceries of any one of them. This one example must suffice to show the vast importance of Biblical theology to the Sunday-school.

Modern Biblical criticism thus has a double work. It removes an immense amount of crude, indefinite, erroneous and false material which has commonly been brought into the Sunday-school to illustrate everything but the lesson and to dull its points. It presents a solid basis of truth and fact upon which religious lessons may be built that will be firm, reliable, and permanent. Those who teach without taking account of modern Biblical criticism teach a mass of material which will have to be unlearned in a few years to the accompaniment of sad and bitter experiences. Such teachers will have no thanks from their pupils—will have no reward for their services. The rewards of the future are with the faithful teachers who teach nothing but the truth and who search for it as for hid treasures; who in these days of battle between tradition and criticism calmly watch the issues, and, if they cannot decide between them, limit themselves to those matters about which there is no doubt. In those they find the religious instruction which is most suitable for the Sunday-school and which lies safely enshrined back of all human controversies, indestructible and eternal in its quickening truths and facts.

C. A. BRIGGS.

IS THE VALUE OF OUR FAST CRUISERS OVER-ESTIMATED?

BY REAR-ADMIRAL DANIEL AMMEN, U. S. N.

YEARS ago, when the building of fast cruisers was begun by us, the then Secretary of the Navy made a comparison of the destruction effected by the Confederate cruisers in our civil war with what might obtain through our superior means of destruction, should we have a war with a commercial power. Let us see how far a comparison will hold good :

The Confederate cruisers were wooden vessels of some twelve hundred tons displacement, and had sail power through which they could make long voyages at a fair rate of speed without the use of coal. In crossing calm belts, near the equator or elsewhere, a few tons of coal would expedite them greatly, or, when a vessel was sighted, would enable them to overtake her, and if she carried our flag, they seized whatever they desired, took the crew on board, burned the vessel, and landed her crew at the most convenient time. With the favors that were shown these cruisers, surreptitiously and openly, in British ports, to which they always went when convenient, in whatever sea, their coal and other supplies were kept up. Ocean telegraphy had not the same extension as now. They committed ravages in one region, then would sail to another, choosing a sailing route where, under the prevailing winds, a concentration of vessels might be expected, and there reenact their destructive purposes, and then set sail again for some distant point on some other route where they were likely to find their prey. Under such conditions they were capable of effecting great damage and avoiding the few vessels that were sent after them. At length the "Alabama" was willing to risk a combat with the

"Kearsarge" off Cherbourg, and then there was one Confederate cruiser less.

It is now more than twenty-eight years since the close of the civil war; the mode of propulsion and the speed of merchant steamers have undergone a great transformation, and the routes of traffic of greatest value have changed. Although for some years and at this time the aggregate tonnage of sailing vessels has been steadily augmenting relatively to steamships engaged in ocean traffic, sailing vessels of belligerents would naturally be laid up in the event of war, as would a large proportion of ocean steam tramps of the nations engaged. Their traffic in cargoes not liable to seizure as contraband would pass to neutral flags. Should we have a war with any considerable power other than Great Britain, we would find that increased war rates of insurance would throw almost the entire traffic on the high seas of both combatants under the British flag. In Asiatic waters France would have steamers from her Mediterranean ports, probably not many in number; they would run little risk of capture by our cruisers, had we unhappily a war with that power. Cable dispatches would give information of the proximity of hostile vessels and enable the steamers either to remain in port or to be conveyed by fast vessels-of-war.

In a war with Great Britain our fast cruisers would be subject to grave disadvantages. An examination of "Coaling, Docking and Repairing Facilities of the Ports of the World, 3d Edition, 1892," published by the Navy Department, will show how illusory is the idea that our fast cruisers could seriously affect the merchant flag of Great Britain in distant seas, where neutrality laws would estop coal supplies, and dockage to clean their bottoms, in neutral ports. The docking and coaling facilities set forth in the document referred to, if marked on a chart of the globe, show how conveniently the cruisers and the battleships of Great Britain can reach out in all directions with clean bottoms and full coal bunkers. This favorable condition could not obtain for any other power, even should all neutrals fail to observe their neutrality obligations. We may assume that our fast cruisers are the equals of those of any other power, and probably a few are superior, especially those with triple screws. Regarding the map of the globe and the British coaling stations marked thereon, we perceive that had we a much greater number

of the best of cruisers, the probable results of their visiting distant seas would not be satisfactory, as I propose showing in the following pages, through the opposing forces that Great Britain would have, scattered far and wide over the seas. Our cruisers, doubtless, have as high a rate of speed as those of Great Britain; there is no reason to suppose that the results of the speed trials, as given, are not exact; yet, only a novice will have the idea that they will represent the normal speed on the high-seas. Contractors take care that nothing is omitted to make the speed all that is possible, with bottoms perfectly clean, picked coal, and the employment of the most expert firemen, with forced draught. It is well known that considerable repairs are frequent after speed trials, from taxing the machinery and boilers to their utmost, and perhaps injuries result that do not come to light for some time. A forced draught is so destructive to boilers when inexperienced firemen are employed, that only a few hours steaming may seriously impair them. Captain Evans stated that when in command of the "Baltimore" in the Behring Sea, he ordered a forced draught in order to overtake a vessel before dark; as a result the boilers had 500 leaky tubes. The British fleet operations give analogous results. A British admiral has recently styled a forced draught a device of the devil. The question may occur why vessels of war cannot or do not use forced draughts as well as ocean liners. The latter have the best firemen obtainable; if one lacks in intelligence or usefulness he is discharged at the earliest opportunity; in the naval service he cannot be discharged for ordinary incompetency—nor can he be schooled to competency. It is gratifying to see that Engineer-in-Chief Melville suggests lengthening the smokestacks to create a stronger natural draught and dispensing with the use of forced draughts, as has been done on board of the "Campania" and the "Lucania," the ocean liners that have made the shortest runs across the Atlantic.

There is not one of our fast cruisers that can profit to any extent by the use of sail power even in strong winds, although their enginery enables them to attain a high rate of speed, with a correspondingly large coal consumption. As already stated, the "Alabama" and other Confederate cruisers did very well under a low head of steam; in fact, they did not require a large coal consumption when steaming ten knots an hour, which was at that

time sufficient for their purposes. In trade-winds or other breezes abeam, or abaft the beam, they would readily sail more than ten knots per hour. A modern fast cruiser on an unfrequented sea, with disabled machinery or without coal, would be as pitiable an object as can well be conceived. Her crew would hail the appearance of an enemy in war as a much needed friend.

Our navy does not possess one sheathed vessel of war ; after a few months in tropical waters our fastest cruiser would be slow indeed. If twenty knots was obtained on the speed trial, with the same number of revolutions it would probably not exceed fourteen knots. This great falling off can be verified by an examination of logbooks. Ten years ago I was given specimens of barnacles taken from the bottom of the "Ranger" that had spent seven months, after a previous dockage, in voyages to and from the coast of Mexico and in making surveys. Barnacles more than an inch long covered the entire bottom, and a heavy marine vegetable growth supplemented the barnacles. Her voyage to San Francisco was at less than half the speed, with the same number of revolutions per hour as when she left with a clean bottom.

Eighteen years ago, when the construction of half a dozen iron vessels was discussed at the so-called Board meetings of the chiefs of bureaus, presided over by the Secretary of the Navy, the late Rear-Admirals Case, Reynolds, C. R. P. Rodgers, and myself insisted that some of the vessels should be sheathed. The Chief of Bureau of Construction craftily replied, "That could be done afterward." He was an "expert," and we were supposed to know nothing as to what should be done in turn in the progress of construction. To sheathe a vessel after her construction would require tearing her to pieces in a great measure.

In all metallic constructions of ships subject to salt water navigation a marked galvanic action sets in, to the steady destruction of the metal for which the action has most affinity. A few years ago the British armored ship "Warspite" was docked at Esquimaux for the purpose of remedying defects in putting on her copper sheathing. It was said that there were metallic connections, through nails or otherwise, between the sheathing and the ship's iron bottom, resulting in serious injury. The actual details of the supposed neglect or mistake never came to me. Of all metals in common use, zinc is the most subject to destruction, the other

metals remaining unaffected by galvanic action in connection with it, and zinc taking "the bite." I have suggested to experts the possible advantage of sheathed vessels having a strip of zinc of two feet in width put round the vessel, extending from a few inches below the water line to more than one foot above it. If fastened to the hull above and below with suitable metallic battens, the zinc could be renewed readily as might be required.

In looking over the *Naval Annual*, of Lord Brassey, an American may well be startled at the array of vessels-of-war of Great Britain, from battleships to torpedo gunboats. In order to approximate as to the value or the worthlessness of the major part of these vessels, I endeavored to classify them. Of seventy-nine armored vessels, eight are sheathed with copper and five with zinc; eighteen were built prior to 1870, and twenty-one more before 1880. Should all of these thirty-nine vessels be regarded only as naval scarecrows, thirty-three yet remain built since that time or are near completion.

Of unarmored cruisers there are sixty-two with iron or steel bottoms, forty-nine others are sheathed with copper and two with zinc. Twenty-one others are composite, of various sizes, all of them above 1,000 and some of them over 2,000 tons displacement. They have iron or steel frames, wooden bottoms, and copper sheathing. No note was made by me of minor vessels, nor of those belonging to the colonies. Of the total, twenty-four were built prior to 1880, twenty-four from 1880 to 1885 inclusive, and seventy-seven from that date to the present, some of them not yet completed. Of the total a rough estimate gives 100 which may be supposed available cruisers for any part of the world as commerce destroyers.

In addition to the above force for commerce destroyers and against hostile cruisers are twenty-three merchant vessels to be fitted out in event of war. The shortest of them is 420 feet in length. Four of them have an average speed at sea of more than nineteen knots, and the remainder have good ocean speed.

Rapid firing guns have been introduced into all navies within the past thirty years, and, in my belief, will prove a surprising factor in naval warfare where crews are not protected by armor of sufficient thickness to resist the penetration of three, six, and twenty pound projectiles thrown from rapid-fire guns. These steamers that may be drafted in service, and others, while en-

gaged in traffic can probably be more effectively armed with a number of such guns than with heavy batteries. Half a dozen six-pounders put on the stern of a vessel endeavoring to escape, directing their fire particularly at the smokestacks of her pursuer, would probably riddle and tear them to pieces, by carrying away whole sheets on the farther side, at a distance of more than three thousand yards, and otherwise inflict great damage to even the typical fast cruiser. At a distance of more than two thousand yards six-pound projectiles are capable of piercing conning towers of three inches thickness of iron. They could sweep the decks of a large number of ventilators, sending them flying in fragments as missiles, killing and wounding the guns' crews of the main battery that could not be served with the same accuracy at the same range. Six pounders, fired from the shoulder, admit of the same accuracy of aim as ordinary small-arms, even in a moderate seaway, when a heavy gun would be fired with great inaccuracy. Of course the fast cruisers have rapid-fire guns. It seems to me that their combats will be settled in a larger degree with their rapid fire than with their heavy guns.

From these considerations, there seems little prospect of great success on the high-seas in the capture of British merchant vessels by whatever nation, should she be engaged in war. Modern fast cruisers have not that kind of endurance and ability to keep the sea for months that belonged to the Confederate cruisers and ours of that period.

To those who think that the world is made up of adulators and fault-finders I would say that we should be content as a whole with our fast cruisers. They will serve purposes in war that could not be dispensed with without grave disadvantages. Were all of our battleships that are now under construction, completed, and the number doubled, we still, in my belief, would have undefended coasts, so far as the navy should serve as an indispensable auxiliary to fortifications and for its own purposes. The Bureau of Construction has not shown the prescience that was claimed for it in advance of execution. Ships have been found deeper in the water than was desired; others are said to be top-heavy. A battleship constructed on plans said to have been surreptitiously obtained from a British firm at considerable cost has not the necessary structural strength from a lack of sufficient material, which seems remiss, inasmuch as iron and steel

are abundant and cheap. Upon other cruisers and battleships yet untried, the gilded rays of hope and pride yet remain, perhaps now, with a certain amount of apprehension that all modifications in design may not prove to be improvements.

There are some of our countrymen that in naval and in other matters set their hopes of success in closely following the footsteps of the British ; as the sunflower turns its face to its god, morning, noon, and when he sets, so do they keep their faces reverently and hopefully turned to Britishers for personal and professional inspiration. They are oblivious to the fact that for half a century Great Britain and other European powers have adopted largely American ideas in naval construction and armaments. They may be known by their mutton-chop whiskers and their British accent and dress—more readily acquired than British ideas. Yet as I write, there lies before me the morning paper, and in it appears that “the trials of the new British cruiser ‘Theseus’ yesterday were not satisfactory !” Let us console ourselves sympathetically that Great Britain has made a great many blunders in her naval constructions. Why should we not throw the mantle of charity over ours ? We should not flatter ourselves, as the ignorant are prone to do, with the belief that one of our battleships is the equal of two of an enemy. It is a fair presumption that, ship for ship, they should be the equal of any force. Were our naval fighting force doubled and concentrated at one port on the Atlantic and another on the Pacific, there are several European powers that could send double the number of our vessels in either port from their normal force to attack us, and leave still a larger contingent at home.

We have coasts on the Atlantic and on the Pacific, each of thousands of miles of extent, and bays and inlets from which the entrance of an enemy cannot be estopped by fortifications. The navy should be able to drive him away or to destroy his ships of whatever type. A letter by me to the Secretary of the Navy will be found in the appendix to his report of 1883. It stated briefly what I had to say on the subject of coast defence at that time. Recently I have expressed the same ideas more at length in *The Old Navy and the New*. As an indorsement and warrant for them, as regards the best and most effective arm for our naval coast defence, the recent writings of Lord Armstrong may be read with interest, the more as Sir Edward Reed, for many years

the chief naval constructor for the British Admiralty, and now a member of the House of Commons, and two other members and eminent shipbuilders, Mr. Alan and Mr. Harland, support the same ideas. In the London *Times* of November 18, Admiral Elliot, a distinguished officer of the British Navy, gives also his unequivocal support to the utterances of Lord Armstrong, which are clear and unmistakable in expression, that battleships and the various classes of vessels-of-war of Great Britain will not meet the necessities of the situation. He states that Great Britain should have marine rams pure and simple, built for that special purpose ; that the supposed protection of any vessel from ramming through any thickness of armor was a fallacy, as I have said for the past fifteen years.

I entertain the same idea that was expressed by the late Rear-Admiral C. R. P. Rodgers not long before his death : That should Great Britain be disposed to make war upon the United States, it would be in a sudden dash with all her forces to demand enormous ransoms from our unprotected cities and coasts, or effect so widespread a ruin as to appal us into an immediate submission to any terms she might propose. This idea could not be entertained for a moment should we provide the means for coast defence suggested in the papers above referred to. There is a passive, yet very weighty, consideration which British statesmen may well regard. Even a non-intercourse between the two countries for a few months would reduce the British masses to great misery, and, were the period of its continuance indefinite, to actual despair. With us, the masses would not suffer want in any degree, but there would be heavy taxes, discomfort, and, perhaps, great losses inflicted on personal property, much of which would be British, and certainly a great deal of national humiliation should we fail to make our preparation for a war, before it was rudely thrust upon us.

The centres of maritime power of Great Britain, belting the world, and forbidding any reasonable prospect of the United States or other power preying upon her merchant marine, should be regarded rather in a spirit of gratulation than the reverse, by all peoples who speak the same language. These centres of maritime power are no less the centres of a widespread manly civilization ; it is only on placing a map of the world before you and regarding carefully the areas of continents and of islands, where

kind and thoughtful mothers teach the same language to their children, that the fact can be appreciated in its full significance, that a great family is widely spread over the earth, to work out a great destiny. In families, in groups, and singly, for centuries the founders of these centres have left their homes as emigrants, with tears in their eyes, yet with strong arms and brave hearts, to meet hardships and to found homes and hearthstones for themselves and their offspring; and we see how well they have done it—this great family, now so widely spread, is yet in its merest infancy as regards numbers, wealth, and power. Of the many millions with hearthstones so far apart, whose mothers teach them their duties to their God and to man, not one should be so thoughtless as to fail in sympathy of kinship towards all. In one of his annual messages to Congress, President Grant expressed, very happily and concisely, his ideas of the growing importance of the language that finally to a great degree would serve as a common means of communication for the many diverse tongues of the human race.

Far be from me, or from a vast majority of my countrymen, to wish to see the maritime power of the mother-country seriously impaired. While it may be her pride, and sometimes a rather distasteful boast, it is a heavy load to bear; it is her necessity—all who speak her language and are gifted with a sentiment of kindness may wish and hope to have her endure it until the preponderance of her offspring, scattered over the wide world, may give her that moral and material support that will suffice to aid in her protection from envious enemies who may wish to assail her.

DANIEL AMMEN.

WAGNER'S INFLUENCE ON PRESENT-DAY COMPOSERS.

BY ANTON SEIDL.

It is probable that more has been said and written about Wagner than about any other composer that ever existed. This is not surprising, for besides being one of the greatest geniuses that the world has yet produced, he represented a revolution from musical tradition that had been held in honor for centuries, and he possessed a combination of talents, any one of which might achieve fame for any man and all of which would not only make him the object of universal attention, but the target of criticism. Under these circumstances it is only natural that in the minds of many people the true significance of his work should be either lost sight of altogether or obscured beneath the flood of literature concerning its manifold phases which has for many years poured from the press. His partisans are as prone to exaggerate his merits as his enemies are to detract from them. Nevertheless, the real Wagner stands before us in the achievements that followed one another in such rapid succession during his long career. His work must be judged by itself and in its relation to the music of his predecessors.

One of the commonest and one of the most serious mistakes about Wagner is the general belief that he was the first to appreciate the inadequacy of the old school of music, and to strive for higher forms. But, as a matter of fact, Gluck first felt this inadequacy, and his compositions show that he tried to elevate music above the level on which the composers of his day worked. The original production of *Orpheus* in Paris created a public disturbance similar to that witnessed there when Wagner had his earliest Parisian representation. But the genius of Gluck

was far inferior to Wagner's; he could only strive toward the goal that his successor attained. He deserves credit for what he tried to do, and it is not just that his efforts should be lost sight of in the glory of one who succeeded where he partly failed. Wagner's conception of what opera in its highest form should be was none the less sublime because it had dimly occurred to another.

The wedding of the drama and music—this was the underlying principle of that conception. The drama Wagner regarded as the expression of the life of man. But he saw that this expression was in a sense incomplete, that it could be made adequate, perfect, even sublime, if united with music in perfect harmony with its character and spirit. Before his time the so-called grand opera consisted chiefly of feeble *libretti*, to which primitive, almost childish melodies had been set; there was no life, no passion, no soul, in most of these works. One might be pardoned for comparing them with musical puppets singing from phonographs.

Yet, before Wagner's time, Beethoven and Weber were following in the footsteps of Gluck. But, until toward the very end of his life, Beethoven's conceptions, with the exception of his single opera *Fidelio*, were purely musical; he worked, so to speak, almost wholly in the realms of the ideal. He appreciated the possibility of expressing in music the highest human emotions, those that called for dramatic power. His symphonies and his opera show that he tried to attain this expression; they represent a steady development culminating in a splendid climax in the Ninth Symphony, when at last he found music inadequate and felt the need of words. So in the solos and choruses of this symphony he used words with fine effect. As for his opera, that embodies his attempt to express his conception of perfect conjugal love. In the case of Weber we find a composer who felt, as Wagner did, the greatness of the higher opera, and in his works he tried to make the most of the opportunities it presented. Yet he was hampered by clinging to the old forms of music, through which he expressed his ideas. Both Beethoven and Weber may be said to occupy the middle ground between the old and the new schools of compositions. But for their achievements the work of Wagner would have been far more revolutionary than it actually was. They prepared the way for him.

But the old style was still firmly established by tradition, and Wagner bravely set himself to the task of destroying tradition. He saw that the passions of mankind offered material for a noble drama fit to be the vehicle of a noble music. So he proceeded to look about for subjects suitable to his purpose. These he found in the Norse legends, which he drew upon extensively and which he developed and almost transformed by his genius.

For it should be borne in mind that Wagner's literary ability was of the highest quality ; it was in perfect harmony with the spirit of his music. Dr. Foerster, formerly director of the German Theatre in Berlin, and later of the Court Theatre in Vienna, once expressed his belief to me that if the *Meistersinger* were produced as a play, by first-class artists and under favorable surroundings, it would make a great success. In this connection I recall a remark made to me by Wagner himself on the occasion of the first performance of *Rheingold* in Berlin, which I conducted. On the programme he called it a "comic play with music," and the cast was truly ideal, made up as it was by great singers who were also great actors : Scoria, the basso, of Vienna ; Schelper, the baritone, of Leipzig ; Lieban, the comic tenor, of Berlin ; and Vogel, the heroic tenor, of Munich. At the close of the opera, Wagner, who might be supposed to think chiefly of the music and of the orchestration, said to me : "I have never seen it *acted* so well." I quote this simply to illustrate the great stress he put upon the dramatic side of grand opera. He appreciated the advantages of a composer's being able to unite in himself the two gifts of writing both book and music, for he used to say that only the composer himself knew just what he wanted to express, meaning, of course, that if he undertook to give musical color, so to speak, to the ideas of others, he would be greatly handicapped.

All composers at the present time realize that there is much truth in this belief, but few or none of them possesses the slightest literary ability. Their talent tends to isolate them from all other kinds of creative work. This fact is due partly to their education, which is special, perhaps in a sense narrow. It would be well if all musicians, before beginning their careers, could have a thorough, a well-rounded education. I have observed, however, that in youth most of them display little taste for those studies that do not bear directly or indirectly upon their art: even when they have established themselves they do very little

reading or studying outside of music. Their labors are exacting and they prefer to use their leisure in recreation and in other ways that are not at all literary.

Under these circumstances, we cannot expect our composers to follow Wagner's example by attempting to write their own *libretti*. If they did, many of them would make dreary failures. Moreover, I believe that it is possible for composer and author to work together in perfect harmony, one being simply the counterpart of the other. The slavish imitation of Wagner's methods cannot lead to good results. Each man must do his work according to his capacity; it can be nothing but folly for him to aim at results that are utterly beyond his powers, simply because one far more gifted has achieved them.

It is this slavish imitation of Wagner that has caused the barrenness of contemporary music in Germany. The young German composers, not content with being stimulated by the spirit of the master, have actually reproduced his harmonies as if these were their own. They simply give us Wagner over again, weakened, of course, by their own feebler imagination. They make the mistake of confounding Wagner's work with his style, both of which, though they must be considered together, are really distinct. For example, in painting, if an artist wishes to paint in the style of a Raphael, he has a perfect right to do so; but he has no right to copy a Raphael Madonna and pass it off as his own creation. So, in what has come to be called Wagnerian music, a composer may write as much of it as he pleases; but he must not steal harmonies that were conceived by another. In other words, no matter what school of music a man may choose to follow, his individuality must always rise superior to it; he must never allow it to fetter his imagination, to cause him to imitate; for imitation, of course, is death to the creative impulse.

It is perhaps natural that our young composers should be overshadowed by such a colossal figure as Wagner was, and for that matter always will be in the history of music. Those who lived while he lived, or those who are now writing while his influence is still fresh, are likely to show the effect of his power most conspicuously. But the lesson should be impressed upon every creative artist that his work, to be true, or effective, or lasting, must express himself—must spring from his own nature; otherwise, it will be the merest echo, and it will die away without leaving a

trace behind it. Let him, by all means, take advantage of the system of Wagner, and follow that. This is quite different from trying to reproduce the originator of the system.

So far as the highest form of opera is concerned, I believe that Wagner has established that forever. It seems to me to be the perfect expression of life through the union of the drama with music, and, as such, to be adequate and final. Other great composers are sure to come, but they will work according to the principles which Wagner has established. These principles are rapidly gaining recognition in most of the countries where the arts are held in honor. Even in France and Italy, Wagner is gaining recognition, and the French and Italian composers are imitating him just as their German *confrères* have been doing for the past few years. By-and-by all of these will appreciate the folly of this, and, profiting genuinely by the work he has done, they will develop music of spontaneous and genuine power.

And this brings me to a consideration of the influence of the higher music in this country. Americans have shown a fine appreciation of Wagner, though the American composers have not as yet given evidence of a disposition to imitate him in the composition of operas. Their abilities seem to lie in the writing of oratorios and concert music, and in this field there are several very promising workers; indeed, workers who have already achieved brilliantly. But I know of no reason why Americans should not write grand operas expressive of their own life. Of course, this country is so young that its history does not afford material for great conceptions as do the European countries, rich in legend and tradition. One might go for material back to the Indians, but it would be pretty thin; it would be lacking in those majestic elements which Wagner found in the Norse legends. But if an author like Mr. Howells were to write a book for an American grand opera, it seems to me that it would afford an opportunity for a composer to achieve something really great in music. But, however American the theme and treatment might be, the music could not be considered distinctively American; for it would possess qualities that might belong to almost any other nation. Moreover, it might be written by a French, or a German, or an Italian composer living in this country. For there is a great deal that is absurd in the distinctions so often made between the music of different nations. All music belongs to the

same art, and all musicians have certain fundamental qualities in common.

It must be borne in mind that the conditions by which art is surrounded in this country are peculiar. Here is a conglomerate people, made up of those who have brought from their native countries their native traditions. These traditions have their peculiar influence, and if one were keen and had patience enough to give the study necessary to detecting these, they could no doubt be traced to their sources. Dr. Dvorak, for example, has called attention to the negro melodies; but his theory with regard to them has been generally misunderstood. I have no doubt that these melodies came originally from Europe; they were probably modified, however, by the influence of the new environment upon those who brought them here. It is quite possible that the servitude of the negroes, or the laziness of their dispositions, gave to the melodies the melancholy cadence, the slow movement, that is characteristic of them. But this, of course, is only a surmise. It serves simply to illustrate my point that America has no national music, and is not likely to produce music free from European traditions.

This fact, however, cannot be considered in the least as a discouragement to American composers. The best they can do is to go on working according to the highest rules of art that have been discovered, and expressing their own individuality; for in every art there is a vast difference between nationality and individuality. There is every reason why they should rejoice that thus far they have not been enslaved by Wagner's influence, as their brother-workers in Germany have been. And from Germany they should receive their warning. The field of grand opera is open to them; it offers them the best opportunities for achievement. It is only in this field that they can work out their greatest conceptions. Wagner must be their pattern, for, as I have already said, he represents the complete development of grand opera; but as the German composers have shown, they must use his methods without abusing them.

That grand opera is destined to become a permanent institution and an educational influence in this country I have no doubt whatever. It has already been compared to a college; but it is really more important, for it educates the whole people, whereas a college educates only the few. Without it any system of civiliza-

tion is incomplete. In Germany, the leading cities have each its own opera-house ; in America, we must begin with one only, and that, of course, should be in the chief city. But an opera established in New York could exert its influence in several of the other leading cities by giving adequate performances in these at different periods during the season. Later, such cities as Boston and Chicago should have operas of their own, just as Leipsic and Dresden have at the present time.

Until a movement in this direction is inaugurated we cannot expect American composers to achieve in grand opera ; for, under the conditions in which they are now working, they receive practically no encouragement whatever to make such artistic endeavor. The labor of writing an opera is enormous ; the rewards should be proportionate ; but so far as this country is concerned, they are so meagre that they might as well be left out of account altogether. This is a disheartening fact, but we might as well face the truth. However, as I have intimated, I believe that the conditions will be changed—that the time is coming when American composers will receive an incentive to put forth their best efforts. Some of them, indeed, are already doing so in spite of discouragement, for there are composers who care more for their art than for gain. I know of one American composer who has written his own *libretto* and is now at work on the music for it. All this promises well for the future.

To those American musicians who are ambitious to undertake the writing of grand opera I can only reiterate the great lesson which Wagner has given them and which I emphasized at the beginning of this article ; that is, the fundamental importance of making the music the natural expression of the drama. In other words, the *libretto* must be regarded as the basis of the work ; and as this is essentially a play, as much a play, indeed, as any that is spoken and acted, it must be treated according to the laws of dramatic construction. For this reason, the composer, before putting pen to paper, before even conceiving a harmony, must catch the spirit of the *libretto*, and study it in every detail from the point of view of the drama. To do this adequately, he should be thoroughly acquainted with the inner workings of the theatre ; everything should be regarded in its effect as passing from the stage to the auditorium. Of course, the composer who writes his own words knows best just what kind of music fits

them ; but even he must look at his work as a dramatic whole. He who, on the other hand, composes to words written for him must assume the same point of view that the librettist has taken in developing the plot.

As a preparation for such work, nothing can be finer than the study of Wagner's operas, representing as they do the perfect blending of the drama and music. They should be examined in every detail, for in all their minute parts this quality is evident. The danger of such study I have pointed out ; but by those who are warned against this danger beforehand and who appreciate the significance of the warning, it can be avoided. Its existence is in no sense a reflection upon the master's genius ; on the contrary, it is a tribute to the overwhelming power of that genius. And at the present time, to American musicians who have shown a love for Wagner, but who have as yet refrained from imitating him, he offers at once an example and an incentive.

ANTON SEIDL.

THE GLORIFICATION OF THE JEW.

BY PROF. ABRAM S. ISAACS, EDITOR OF "THE JEWISH MESSENGER."

OF recent years the Jew, always a subject for treatment more or less heroic by kings, pontiffs, knights, and commoners, since he was made to assume the wanderer's rôle and told remorselessly to "move on" after any brief respite from the agony of unrest, seems to be receiving a little juster and more humane consideration. In civilized climes, at least, where civil and religious freedom is assured to all classes, the humanity in the Jew has become recognized, his services in the struggle for intellectual and religious liberty are more appreciated, and the edge of antipathy, so sharp and unrelenting of old, is losing much of its keenness.

Many factors have combined to bring about this result. Ours is a century which, with all its fads and fancies, is fatal to prejudices, however ancient. It is an image-breaking age, that is disposed to see with its own eyes. Commerce, travel, education, a community of interests, the amenities of business and social intercourse, are giving the death-blow to a host of old-time bigotries and promoting good feeling and generous co-operation for the common welfare on the broadening borderland between the creeds. Popular errors are persistent, but, happily, not everlasting. If the Spaniard thought that heretics had tails, and eminently respectable Americans used to discern a dim connection between a Quaker's hat and a rainy sky, one need not be surprised that the Jew has cut so sorry a figure in popular proverbs, and that his caricature and counterfeit still drag out an inartistic, if very obtrusive, existence on the stage and in the comic weeklies.

It is not our purpose to dwell for a moment on those bitter ages of crucifixion for the Jew, even if relieved here and there by sunset gleams of hope. Nor is it necessary to discuss what justification, if any, existed for the long-continued travail. That he has survived it all, that he has proved neither coward nor traitor,

is surely not accidental. God's shadow still rests on history. There is no blank page between the Testament of the Past and the Testament of the Present. The unknown factor in events has come to be the best known and most positive. The survival of the Jew and Judaism, this magnificent persistence in the face of a thousand odds, would indicate some high purpose. There must be compensation for suffering, like sunshine after rain.

Now the most remarkable indication of the civilized world's changed attitude towards the Jew is not so much the blessing of political emancipation bestowed at last ; for he has merely shared in the triumphs enjoyed in this century by all creeds and opinions. His privileges are not exceptional in this respect. It is rather his appearance in literature as a subject no longer for derision, but for earnest contemplation and study, which is most significant. Since Lessing idealized Moses Mendelssohn, the Jew in fiction has acquired a certain continuity, which, despite aberrations and exaggerations, constitutes a most suggestive sign of the times. The world is apparently half ashamed of the past, and would make atonement. It admires pluck. The Jew has been the under-dog in the fight. He has been flung into the mud, and then blamed if his garments were soiled. He maintains his old attitude unflinchingly. He adheres to his Law. He is courageous, persistent, no idler or dreamer, but a worker in every field open to him. He is restless, eager, quick to seize favorable opportunity, patient, biding his time. Is the world touched at last ? Does it realize that it need not go to antiquity for heroic types ? The antique is at its doors in the despised Jew. Whatever the reason, it hastens to repair the wrong and utilizes the Jew and his creed, his hopes, his achievements, his aspirations, as material for popular fiction, so that the Jew is no longer a stranger at the hearths of mankind. It was George Eliot, perhaps, who set the fashion, and her *Daniel Deronda*, with all its shadowy and fantastic outlines, embodied a useful lesson. Since her day, it is difficult to keep pace with the stream of books that illustrate the Jew in fiction, while countless articles in the magazines and reviews deal with the Jewish question, which has become a symposium, international and interconfessional, to which some of the clearest and most prominent writers and thinkers industriously contribute.

It is fortunate that the Jew's vindication does not rest upon fiction alone. It is possible for the Jew of fiction to be a distortion—to be an ideal and give a wholly untrue picture. The modern author may err as much in one direction as the mediæval painter did in another when he gave us saints of Judæa with the features of Dutch and Flemish peasants. Contemporary history is the ultimate test. The position of the Jew to-day in life and thought has the basis of fact, not fiction. There is hardly a field in which he has not gained prominence. The rise of anti-Semitism is only one evidence of the Jew's strength and versatility. It is due chiefly to *Brodneid*—to envy. That is the secret of prejudice against the Jew.

There can be no doubt that the Jew's dispersion has made him a cosmopolitan. He possesses the faculty of adaptation. He is at home everywhere. Hence his versatility and range. Time was when he was restricted by church and state to the solitary occupation of money-lender, but now he roams at will in every field, although centuries of exclusive association with finance have admittedly developed his abilities in that direction. In his case, it is not the intensity of genius which has won him triumphs, but the genius of intensity and concentration. His powers have been developed by environment. Old-time Jewish education was wonderfully stimulating. It is a blunder to speak of the Talmud as stunting and dwarfing the Jew. The study of the Talmud gave bent and nutriment to the Jewish brain and preserved the race from stagnation. Moral and religious forces, too, springing from the home and parental teaching, were active in shaping the young and giving them wholesome safeguards and balance-wheels.

What, then, is the Jew's record to-day? What does he contribute to human knowledge, to science in all its branches, to art, philanthropy, learning, literature, in their myriad aspects? Does he preside over the destinies of states? Does he rule in the parliaments of the world? Does he lead in social movements as well as in the exchanges? Is he an interpreter of science as in mediæval times, in centuries called the Dark Ages, when he was the physician of princes, the adviser of kings and caliphs, poet, philosopher, grammarian, mathematician, ambassador?

It was once the intention of James Russell Lowell to collect material which should illustrate the varied record of the Jew in every department of activity. He felt, perhaps, that justice had

been scantily done to Jewish achievement and that such a roll call would silence forever the slanderer. If one would sketch in outline a chronicle of Jewish endeavor, and limit its range to the past few decades only, what an object-lesson would be unfolded !

It is about forty years since Heine passed away. In poetry his place is still to be filled. But although Dusseldorf refuses the proffered monument in his honor because he was of Jewish birth, the race which Heine loved and hated, scorned yet idolized in the contradictions of his genius, has attained in Germany indisputable prominence. In the liberal movement it was Ferdinand Lassalle, whose name will always be associated with Socialism, while now it is Singer, who is one of the most distinguished leaders in Parliament. Eduard Lasker, educated to become a rabbi, left an imperishable record among German orators. The gentle Berthold Auerbach, whose idealism was rudely disturbed by the persecutions in Russia, has earned a permanent rank in German literature, along with August Bernstein, whose services in popularizing science are not to be underestimated; Leopold Kornpert, the poet of the Ghetti; and Karl Emil Franzos, with his picturesque novels and sketches of Roumanian and Galician life. One might add a large number of popular and instructive writers, men of the calibre of Gustav Karpeles, Julius Rodenberg, Paul Lindau, and Paul Hepe. If we add the large and constantly increasing coterie of university professors, specialists in nearly every science and pursuit, who maintain the reputation of a Philip Jaffe in history, a Bernays in classical philology, a Gustav Weil in Arabic lore, an Abraham Geiger, Zunz, Graetz, and Z. Frankel in rabbinical and Jewish historical science, a Mosenthal in the drama, a Sanders in German philology and a Meyerbeer in music—one may realize what a commanding array of talent is presented. The past few decades may be aptly termed a Jewish Renaissance in Germany in all that pertains to culture and enlightenment. M. Lazarus, H. Steinthal, and M. Steinschneider are still at active work.

Perhaps in no country has the Jew become so thoroughly identified with his surroundings as in France. As a result, his position is confessedly high. In music, Halevy; in philosophy, Adolphe Franck; in Oriental studies, Munk Oppert, Jos. Halevy, the Derenbours, and Darmesteter; in Biblical criticism and the science of religion, Salvador; in philanthropy and finance,

Fould, Cremieux, the Rothschilds, the Pereires, and Baron de Hirsch,—are but a few names culled from a lengthy list of French Israelites who occupy a prominent rank in literature, art, science, education, and public service. The voice of Gambetta is stilled, but the Jew in France has capacity and enthusiasm enough to be more than *dilletante* in the problems which beset his country.

If Denmark can produce a critic like Georg Brandes, Holland a painter like Jos. Israels, Russia a composer like Rubinstein and a sculptor like Anatolski (although both have voluntarily shared exile with a million of their poorer brethren); if Italy can point to Maurogonato, Morpurgo, Luzzatti, Alatri—the brilliant contributions of the Jews of England, within the past few decades alone need not arouse surprise. The Earl of Beaconsfield will always be regarded as a Jew, although he is buried in Hughenden churchyard. No conforming Jew could have more ardently championed the cause of Israel. Disraeli's name in statecraft, Montefiore's deeds in philanthropy, are perennial. Sir George Jessel became Master of the Rolls without losing his interest in the synagogue. Lord Rothschild does not find it inconsistent with his dignity to preside over a society for the education of poor Jewish children. Sir Julian Goldsmid can petition Parliament in behalf of the persecuted Jews of Russia. To Schiller-Szinessy is largely due the revival in Hebrew studies in England: and Neubauer and Schechter continue the work. In literature Zangwill is half jester, half moralist, and Joseph Jacobs is likely to develop into an English Grimm. In mathematics Sylvester is a national authority. In Biblical criticism Claude G. Montefiore has rapidly won fame; he is one of a number of young scholars who will advance in many ways the standing and influence of English Judaism. In technical education Sir Philip Magnus is an authority. It was England's chief rabbi, Dr. Herrman Adler, who recently was invited by a society of Christian clergymen to lecture on "Sanitation as Taught by the Mosaic Code."

There is every likelihood that Israel may enter more energetically on a practical work, that its leaders in civilized lands may coöperate in the task of social and economic reform, that Jewish wealth and intellect may unite with the thoughtful and benevolent of every creed, to uplift mankind to a higher level of right-

eousness. The Jew makes no propaganda. No one need be a Jew to share eternal bliss. The Psalmist sprang from a non-Hebrew stock, and in one of his most expressive psalms, still recited in the synagogue, makes purity of heart and cleanliness of hands the conditions for entering God's tabernacle. If the Jew devote the energy and concentration, which have made him so successful in finance, trade, the arts and sciences, to the solemn problems of human betterment, "loosening the bands of wickedness, undoing the heavy burdens, freeing the oppressed, and breaking every yoke," the Messianic age would advance with rapid strides. The unsectarian benevolence of Jewish philanthropists of the stamp of Montefiore and Hirsch and the numerous benefactions by wealthy Jews, "without distinction of creed," are harbingers of the future, faint fore-gleams of coming sunshine that shall brighten and strengthen and unify humanity.

Single characters from Jewish history—Moses, Ruth, Elijah, Samson, the Maccabees—have been seized by composers and made the subjects of elaborate musical treatment. But what a theme for a symphony is the entire history of the Jews! The first movement should embody the Jew's *Lehrjahre*—his centuries of apprenticeship from the era of the patriarchs to the captivity. The second should illustrate his *Wanderjahre*—his centuries of wandering, from the Babylonian exile almost to our own era, marked still by exile for the Jew in benighted lands. The third movement, which should vie in grandeur and joyous exaltation with Beethoven's matchless "Choral" symphony, might depict the Jew's *Meisterjahre*—his epoch of mastery, when the prophet's ideal of a purified humanity, united, uplifted, and glorified—"Have we not all one Father? Hath not one God created us?"—shall be universally acknowledged. What a field here for genius and science! Passionate longing, ardent tenderness, profound compassion, fiery aspiration, rapt devotion, must find their musical expression. Perhaps some Rubinstein of a later day may deem such a theme worthy of his powers. It was Spohr who devoted an entire symphony to "The Power of Sound" to suggest that man is accompanied by music from the cradle to the grave. When the "Israel" symphony is written, let it illustrate "The Power of Righteousness," for that is the flaming text of prophet and sage, of law and psalm, of testament and code, the *leit-motif* of the Jew in history.

ABRAM S. ISAACS.

INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL.

BY J. WILLIAM WHITE, M. D., PH. D., PROFESSOR OF CLINICAL
SURGERY, AND HORATIO C. WOOD, M. D., LL. D.
(YALE), PROFESSOR OF THERAPEUTICS,
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

FOOTBALL has acquired such a hold upon the American people that the question of its merits or demerits as a game must force itself upon every one's attention. Its opponents are just now clamorous. Its supporters, even with nothing to say that has not already been well said, must have the courage of their convictions. In attempting to discuss this matter briefly, it is essential to have a clearly defined point of view. It may well be that football is a useful sport in a large university, where it can be controlled by rigid rule; and yet an evil thing amongst boys, or voluntary associations, or the general youthful public who are under no bonds and who are not to be governed by any laws. The universities of Harvard and Pennsylvania may through their respective teams meet one another upon the field in a gentlemanly manner; and yet rival cycling or boating clubs, or rival gangs of street boys, may make football an excuse for fighting out their jealousies.

The question whether in the community football is or is not a good thing is, however, entirely separate from the question whether it is a good thing in a university. To the first of these questions we do not propose to-day to offer any answer at all, since the space allotted is too small really properly to discuss the one question in which we, as professors in a great university, are most interested. In attempting to answer it a few preliminary truisms must be pardoned, that the line of thought which influences us may be clearly stated.

We know that in every position in life which a man can occupy a fairly developed frame is of great advantage to him ; that, *ceteris paribus*, the man who possesses health is able to do better work than his rival who lacks it ; that health includes in its very essence the idea of a certain amount of strength, and that, to acquire health and strength and the full development upon which they depend, exercise is essential. We know that however admirable systems of collegiate gymnastics may be (and we are firm believers in their value), they often fail in supplying the mental stimulus which in competitive athletics react so beneficially on the grosser tissues. Just as certain areas in the brain and spinal cord atrophy after the removal of a limb, so do all the centres presiding over movement grow and develop when varied exercise is taken, and with them the co-ordinate centres that control the higher cerebral functions. The more varied the exercise, and the more it awakens interest and brings into play the mental faculties, the more beneficial it is to the mind and body reciprocally.

We feel sure that these propositions are demonstrably true. Their application to football seems to us obvious. Let us regard intercollegiate athletics as supplementary to a well-devised system of physical education such as ought to exist at every university and college. The noteworthy contests (exclusive of track athletics which tend to develop specialists in whom one set of muscles is over-developed, but which are of undoubted value to the student body) are those which take place on the river, the baseball field, the tennis court, and cricket ground. Which of them best fulfils the requirements of an ideal exercise ?

Rowing, as practised to-day, develops chiefly the muscles of the back and hips ; it does little for the front arm, practically nothing for the pectoral muscles. Baseball makes but little demand on the left arm or the left side of the chest. Cricket and tennis are also usually "right-sided" games. None of them is to be compared with football in the direction of bringing *all* muscles in play. And, moreover, in none of them except rowing is the preliminary training, so valuable in strengthening the great involuntary muscles, those of the heart and diaphragm, observed with anything like equal strictness.

Certainly whatever physical good can be received from any form of college athletics can be obtained from football, while

above all others it tends to develop self-control, coolness, fertility of resource, and promptness of execution in sudden emergencies involving perhaps personal danger. In other words, no known game compares with football in the development in the individual of those qualities which, while they are sometimes spoken of as the "military virtues," are of enormous value to their possessor in all the struggles of life. A further advantage of football over the other forms of college athletics is that it appeals to a much larger proportion of the men. Thus, probably not more than fifty men in any way take part in the annual training for crews at Pennsylvania; but during the present season, 1893, what with the Varsity team, the scrub teams, the various class teams, and the number of voluntary teams made up of the students, at least 160 men have played the game, many of them daily. About the same number played at Harvard.

These are our chief reasons for approving intercollegiate football. Let us consider the objections.

One who sees for the first time a mass-play in a great game, with a pyramid of struggling bodies; or hears the thump as a man is thrown upon the ground by a hard tackle; or notes the bloody faces and sometimes bloody jackets of the contestants; is very apt to be impressed with the idea that some one must soon be desperately injured or killed, an opinion which grows in strength as he sees man after man assisted or carried from the field, while a substitute steps into his place. Then, if perchance months of parliamentary struggle and newspaper discussion concerning an "undergraduate rule," or some other method of getting rid of a growing rival, has intensified the natural spirit of combat between the colleges, and "slugging" or foul or rough play is indulged in, a confirmed belief in the hopeless brutality of the game fastens itself on the mind of the uninformed observer, who often sincerely believes that he is unprejudiced because he knows nothing about the matter; very much as Sydney Smith is said to have asserted that he never read a book he was to criticise, in order that he might keep his mind free from bias. To those who think that bloody noses, torn ears, blackened eyes, bruises or sprains, or an occasional scalp wound are mighty evils, the game must always be an objectionable one. But to those of us who believe that in the

life of a boy the occurrence of injuries not severe enough to leave permanent traces is not necessarily an evil, but often even a positive good by encouraging fortitude, manliness, and high spirit, the question as to the danger of football in our colleges is only to be answered by absolute statistics.

It must be remembered that we are considering intercollegiate football, as played in this country ; and that all English statistics, based, as they are, upon a game essentially different from American football, played, too, by miners, laborers, and all kinds of people, are foreign to this discussion. The great institutions which this matter most concerns, and which are its representatives at the bar of public opinion, are Princeton, Yale, Harvard, and Pennsylvania. About this time last year the question of the occurrence of fatal or of permanently disabling injury to any football player at these four institutions for the previous decade was submitted by one of the writers to the special authority on the subject in each faculty. The replies, still in his possession, were sent after careful investigation, and established conclusively the fact that *no instance of any permanent injury to a player had occurred in all the long series of contests waged during those ten years on the football field.* We ask that until contradictory and well-sustained evidence be brought forward this statement be accepted on the authority of Dr. Sargent, of Cambridge ; Dr. Seaver, of New Haven ; Dr. Macdonald, of Princeton ; and Dr. White, of Philadelphia. We may add that Dr. Hitchcock has written us that no player has ever suffered permanent injury at Cornell. We know that so far as intercollegiate football among these universities is concerned, the foregoing is true of 1893 also, and we think this fact greatly lessens the force of the objection based on the physical dangers of the game.

We have had, as has been said, about 160 men playing football during the year 1893 at Pennsylvania and without a single broken bone or a seriously injured joint or any accident disabling a player from continuing either his football or his academic duties for any length of time. We do not mean to deny the existence of physical danger, but we believe it possible to minimize it and yet retain all the most useful features of the game, and we are urgent for such a revision of rules as shall bring this to pass. We do insist, however, that the spectacular character of foot-

ball and the frequency of sprains, wrenches, fractures, and other severe or minor injuries occurring in the presence of such multitudes have together led to unintentional and not unnatural exaggeration of the seriousness of football. The accidents of aquatic sports, of horseback riding, of shooting, are vastly beyond and above those of football. In 1890, 4,442 males were drowned in the United States, and 2,336 died from gunshot wounds; a large minority of the former died in the pursuit of aquatic sports, whilst, probably, a large majority of the latter died from accidents occurring with firearms made or used for sport. We have not had time to get together the statistics of aquatic sports in the colleges, but it is noteworthy that within two or three years Princeton lost, by drowning, Brokaw from its baseball team, and Lamar from its football team, whilst Cornell, where aquatics are cultivated so widely and successfully, has in the same way lost at least three of its athletes in the present year.

The allegations as to the demoralizing influence of college football have taken various directions. It has been said, for example, to encourage "professionalism" on the part of the athletic authorities and of the players themselves. The enormous gate receipts of some of the great football games have especially aroused attention, and have given rise to the belief that the game was being played for revenue solely or chiefly. It should, however, be understood that large sums of money are required for the maintenance of the athletic departments of the greater universities, and especially for the legitimate expenses of football itself, and that it is the only college sport which yields revenue; so that the expenses of the whole year have to be largely met from the moneys received from football enthusiasts. When it is remembered that large sums for the maintenance of athletics are yearly contributed by the students themselves, and probably still larger sums by alumni and other persons outside of the immediate college circles; and that, notwithstanding this, many, if not most, of the athletic departments are chronically and sometimes hopelessly in debt, it will be seen that whilst the gate receipts are undoubtedly important to the athletic interests of the institutions involved, they cannot be of direct importance to the players, and that there are many avenues for their honest use. In this respect again the objection to football is really not relevant to the game

itself, but to college athletics as a whole; if these athletics be useful, the fact that they are largely supported by football is an argument for, and not against, the continuance of the game.

The more serious charge that men are bought or bribed to come to certain colleges for the purpose primarily of playing football is one that has been made in reference to other college sports. The temptations in this direction undoubtedly increase with the apparent importance of the game to the university playing it and with the honors and rewards attendant upon success; but we are sure that other college sports have in the past been far more open to this criticism than has football. It is a matter which should be carefully considered by the respective faculties and a proper remedy agreed upon. Personally we believe that the adoption of the "one year's residence rule," which forbids any student taking part in intercollegiate athletics until he has resided an academic year at his university and passed satisfactory examinations upon a full year's work, will prove curative.

Other suggestions, such as the selection of a central body, in New York or elsewhere, to decide on questions of eligibility, seem to us open to grave and obvious objection, but the whole matter is one which does not belong exclusively to football, and, even if a proportion of the accusations are true, cannot be viewed as an evil inherent in that game.

As to the effect of football upon the individual student who enters the team, the most frequently repeated objection is that the intellectual is being sacrificed to the physical, and that the man who plays football must almost of necessity neglect his studies. This, again, as we want clearly to point out, is not an objection to football *per se*, but an objection to all college athletics. As a matter of fact much of the preliminary training for football is done during the vacation period, and certainly more hours are given by the men on the crew in the scholastic period to athletic duties than are required of the football candidates.

As this article is not a general defence of college athletics, we must content ourselves with the statement that, after careful investigation we do not believe football has had the effect of lowering the general average academic standard of either players or onlookers at any of the above-mentioned universities. There has not been time to secure all the actual figures, but such good observers as Professor Richards, of Yale, and Professor Sloane, of

Princeton, are convinced that while the scholarship of the most active players may suffer a little a few weeks before the close of the season, it loses nothing whatever by the end of the year. Under the rules of Pennsylvania a student who is dropped for neglect of his studies into a lower class is thereby debarred from taking part in any intercollegiate contests until the end of the next academic year, or until he is allowed by the faculty to re-enter his class.

Of the four or five members of the Pennsylvania football team of 1892 who have now graduated, one, the captain, won in competitive examination the greatest prize the university offers to its medical class, a position in its hospital; another, who was first honor man of his class, has been made professor in the university, and still another was on the honor list. In this year's team the same proportion seems likely to continue. At Princeton two of the eleven are on the honor list and five are "far above mediocrity." At Yale the average standing of the sixteen members of the academic department who have been connected with the football team this term as players and substitutes is higher than the average standing of the best class in scholarship that has ever graduated there. At Cornell, Professor Hitchcock finds that "the men on the intercollegiate athletic teams have a standing 1.2 per cent. better than the average of the whole college." If we were selecting from any college the young men most likely to endure the strains of business or professional life in this country, and to score successes, we would be disposed to estimate at much more than 1.2 per cent. the actual working superiority of the football players over their classmates.

Of all the objections to football, the one which seems to be the most serious is that which asserts its excessive brutality. There can be no doubt that the game is one into which personal combat enters, as it does into sparring and into wrestling; and whenever this element is present in a game, there is a tendency towards methods which shall be disabling. Such games can only be kept right and proper by the strictest repression of this tendency. We suppose that even the most earnest advocates of the game will acknowledge that in the distant as well as in the near past, very frequently even in the great games, open or concealed slugging, falling on an opponent with the knees, and other methods of injuring the opposing men have been indulged in by

both teams engaged. Our contention is that these acts are not a necessary part of football, indeed are entirely outside of the game itself, though their seeds may exist in the game; are, in fact, noxious tares growing among the wheat. They can be largely eliminated, and must be if football is to maintain its place.

It is very well to say on paper that it is the duty of the authorities of Yale or of Harvard, of Princeton or of Pennsylvania, to teach each its own team not to resort to these methods, but of course the team will always respond to such teaching that it does not "slug" first and that it must defend itself if the other team assails it. The primal fault is neither with the authorities nor with the teams, but partly with the laws of the game; and largely with the umpire. No player should ever be "warned" to abstain from rough play by an umpire, and yet repeatedly we have seen an umpire warn a player, two, three, and even four times in a single game. Dr. Brooks, of Harvard, by relentlessly ordering off the field any one whom he saw guilty of rough play, has accomplished more during the past season in lessening rough play than has any other agency that we know of. If the public demand that umpires shall do their duty, eventually it will be done. What is most needed is rigidity of enforcement of the penalty. We have favored a change of rule which would make intentional foul play directed to the bodily injury of an antagonist count one in the score against the team so offending, and we are still inclined to think the idea of value. The great difficulty at present is that it is impossible for an umpire to fulfil his present duties and at the same time to watch twenty-two men more or less scattered over a football field; so that even with a Brooks as umpire we may have a player, keeping always one eye on the umpire, slugging, kneeling, or elbowing his less astute antagonist, one, two, or three times, with the grim satisfaction finally of seeing this antagonist, goaded to desperation, ordered off the field for foul play. It seems to us essential that there should be hereafter an assistant umpire, whose sole duty should be to watch the men and whose word should be as much law as is that of the umpire in debarring men for rough or foul play of any kind. Let public opinion continue to demand fair play and the secret slugging be stopped by the assistant umpire, and these practices will disappear.

It must be remembered that open "slugging" of an antagonist is not a disabling play; that the player struck is practically never

hurt seriously ; that it is bad football from every standpoint, as even if the striker escape disqualification it removes his attention from the ball and from the team movements often at critical moments, and that it is likely to die out of itself for the above reasons and under the influence of aroused public opinion.

When university teams were usually composed simply of the eleven men there was always a great temptation to the unscrupulous player to attempt to disable one of these antagonists, but at present the substitutes are so nearly equal to men of the first line that a fresh substitute is often of more value than a tired member of the first eleven, so that one temptation to rough play is, in the evolution of the game, being removed.

With unfair and foul plays suppressed, the game may be considered on its merits, and the very hold which it has secured upon the communities of the United States proves, to our thinking, that it has value, and that it meets a need of the hour. It is not a little thing that an American community shall cease for a moment its worship of the golden calf, even if it find a no more worthy idol than a football player, for that player is an impersonation of long-continued self-denial, of severe toil, of stoicism under pain, of persistent struggle for an object which is but an ideal.

We believe that it is better for the people of North America to cultivate rather than repress this sudden growth of national sport. To cultivate is to prune, and we are among those who ask earnestly, not only for the suppression of rough and foul play, but for such modification of the rules as shall lessen the danger to life and limb. It seems to us that the first of these alterations should lead to the elimination of the so-called "mass play." The old open game, more beautiful, less dangerous, perhaps more scientific, should if possible be brought back. It has been suggested that this could be done by lengthening the number of yards required to be made in the three downs. In a mass play very rarely, if ever, can more than a yard or two be made, but as the play is the surest method of making that yard or two, and as the yard or two serves the purpose of keeping the ball, the temptation to the team captain continually to use the mass play is overwhelming. If, however, the yard or two were not sufficient to keep the ball, the captain would much more often select the open play with its greater chances of no gain, but with also its greater chances of large gain.

Moreover, if the referee would peremptorily discourage the practice of attempting to gain ground after the tackle and while the possessor of the ball is on the ground, by instantly calling "down," he would prevent the heaping up of the two teams one on the other, and the consequent likely injury to the players at the bottom of the mass. The present rules permit the referee to do this. Here, again, *enforcement is what is needed.*

If in addition a goal from the field were made of more value, and if the penalty of throwing a back on a fair catch were increased, it seems to us that a far more beautiful and much less objectionable game would result.

It is said, however, that the man who does not learn a foreign language in his youth can never learn it, and as we were so unfortunate as to have been born before the modern game of football it scarcely becomes us to offer even a suggestion to the football experts, who should settle this matter. Formerly the football Intercollegiate Association, recognized as it was by Harvard University (not a party to it), had precisely such authority. To-day this football association seems to us, at least, to have no legal existence, and certainly has no moral authority. The association was composed of four members, two of these members have resigned; the remaining two cannot constitute an association. An association is a college or a collegium, in the old use of the word; the old Roman law states explicitly that three members are necessary to the formation of a collegium. Yale might well have led the athletic world if its cohorts had not this year retired in defeat. Princeton will hardly, we think, though its banners are now triumphant, claim for itself supreme leadership. Certainly, however, it would be but a graceful act for it to request from each of the three other great football universities that representative experts should be appointed who shall meet together to consider *the rules of play*. "Undergraduate rules," composition of teams, and all such burning questions should be banished from this hall of council, where the only thought should be the preparation of a practical, carefully considered code, stripping football of the evils which to-day are fastened upon it, and leaving it what we believe it to be essentially, the best and manliest of all intercollegiate sports.

J. WILLIAM WHITE.

HORATIO C. WOOD.

TARIFF AND BUSINESS.

BY EX-SPEAKER REED.

IF MEN at the beginning of disaster knew precisely what was happening to them, disaster might be greatly mitigated. But men in such cases have to go through much tribulation before they find out the causes of events with sufficient accuracy to enable them to discover the needful remedies. When the symptoms of the oncoming of the present condition of affairs began to show themselves, in May and June, they found the people of the United States full of all manner of strange prepossessions. Men were found, as they are in all ages, much given to hero-worship and much disposed to believe that no harm could happen so long as a man whom they worshipped filled the most important place in the republic, and therefore they shut their eyes to the real facts of the case, or, what was still worse, opened their eyes to behold facts which never existed, and listened only to theories which were mere creatures of prejudice and imagination. Other men looked about them and fancied that the cause of disaster was to be found on the surface, and concluded that the shipments of gold which were but the incidents and harbingers of the coming disaster were the disaster itself. As they had fastened upon a course of action on the part of Congress which did not meet the hopes of those who consented to it or the expectations of those who forced it, they found it very easy to convince themselves, and afterwards the people of the country, that all that troubled us was the Sherman Act, and Congress was called together in hot haste to remove the cause of the disaster and restore peace to the land. All the thought of the nation was bent upon that object. Those of us who ventured to suggest that the causes lay deeper and the reasons were more funda-

mental were regarded, where we had deserved it, as well-meaning gentlemen somewhat addicted to politics, and therefore incapable of a business view of the situation. The first shock to this feeling came when it was apparent that the much worshipped defender of our liberties was powerless to speed the repeal, and the second shock was when the actual repeal did take place, which happened after much struggle and only with the aid of his political foes, who, regardless of the possible advantage their action might give to their adversary, did their full duty by the people. If these shocks, and others likely to follow, will only teach the American people that their sole dependence should be on themselves, and that a good party is better than the best man that ever lived, we shall not have gone through this valley of humiliation entirely in vain.

When at last the Sherman Act was repealed, and the cause of our condition according to all standard Democratic newspapers was removed, there were, owing to the delay caused by the party in power, few people left to rejoice in the success which had been so much heralded only a few months before. Even prior to the repeal, the conviction began quietly to steal over the people that the true cause of the stagnation in business, the true source of all our troubles, was the fact that in power and supreme control over the United States was a party which, however meritorious its individuals might be, as a party was utterly incapable of inventing a policy, or even of carrying out a policy which had been boldly promised and broadly announced.

After this idea had taken possession of the country came the remarkable series of elections which showed neither Republicanism nor Democracy in strict party expression, but a deep sense of the utter incapacity of those in power. All that has followed the elections has but tended to show how just was the judgment of the people.

One would have supposed that after so marked an action on the part of the electors, so widespread, so universal all over that part of the country where the polls represent the results of thinking, and where votes can be cast and counted as cast, that no committee of ways and means would have dared to take incautious action even, let alone make fierce attack upon industries already staggering under the mere dread of their anticipated action. One would have supposed that whatever had been

the prejudices and theories of individual members, they would have listened to the voice of the people thus loudly echoing and re-echoing across the entire continent. Had the committee been made up of men truly representative of the communities which had spoken, that result would have inevitably followed. Had the committee been of Northern Democrats familiar with our Northern industrial centres, and appreciative of the disastrous winter which now threatens our workingmen, heed would have been given to the voice of warning. But, as if anticipating such a possibility, the committee had been so made up that the few Northern men were swallowed up by the Southern contingent; and the bill which now vexes both the present and the future has come to the light of day.

It seems as if, in the way in which it was presented and in all its concomitants, the bill had not only been drawn but had been managed so as to do to our working people the maximum of harm. At the end of the extra session, when very many manufacturers were hoping, not to make money, but to run their mills in such fashion on short time and on wages temporarily low, as that, without loss, or without much loss, they might mitigate the winter cold to their employees, the Committee of Ways and Means, through their chairman, declared that they hoped to begin consideration of their bill by the first day of the session, and press it on from day to day thereafter. December 4th was then but a month off, and there seemed no respite, and therefore mills remained closed. When the framers did present their bill to the committee, the date on which it was to take effect was put at the 1st of March. If the intention had been to continue the paralysis of business by special effort and with malice prepense, no better series of devices could have been invented.

When the bill itself was presented, it had a most remarkable effect. Many men in New England who had thought that protection had nothing but New England in its scope, and who consequently wanted free wool and free coal, so that their own situation might be perfect, whoever suffered, were appalled when they found the price they had to pay for the change they had advocated, and some of them were the first to shut down their mills. Men there and elsewhere found that from one end of the country to the other the tariff affecting industries had been so arranged that in many cases no reduction of wages could

enable manufacturers to go on, since the finished product was at a lower rate than an earlier stage of manufacture, and thereupon commenced that remarkable series of conclaves in committee-room and corridor, where the industries of the country were rectified by retail in cases where the introduction was of such sort as to insure confidence. When the bill reached the committee, not a table had been prepared, not a single comparison had been furnished, and immediate consideration was urged, so that a longing country might taste the new concoction at the earliest moment. That the bill with all its original imperfections was not launched upon the world just as it came from the minds which, in Arkansas, West Virginia, and Missouri, had familiarized themselves with the intricacies of manufactures, was due to the determination of the minority that the people of the country should have at least one week to find out what was to happen to their business.

The result has been that if the bill as a whole is still unendurable some of the mistakes which showed that the committee did not know how to carry out its own intent, have been rectified and cease to be monuments of obvious error. Any one curious to see the changes made, and curious to follow them to their sources, will see that the great interests, the Trusts, which are the pretended objects of Democratic animadversion were capable of taking care of themselves, even before a committee whose fondness for the poor man will be more appreciated than ever when the thermometer falls below zero in the coming months. Had other interests been as potent, who knows but that clapboards, lath, shingles, and lumber generally might have got back to the dutiable list, as well as boards planed and tongued and grooved? Had all the small manufacturers been able to be as well represented as the great ones, many a little industry which will now go under might have had at least a chance for life.

Now that the bill is before us, what is to be said of it? Clearly it is not a bill for revenue only, since it reduces the revenue of the country probably seventy-five millions of dollars, so far as the usual treasury calculations can furnish us any aid in determining what the loss will be. If there be any gain to be anticipated to be set off against this loss, it must come from increased importations, which will just so much diminish American production and be so much taken away from American labor. The bill cannot

claim the merit, if there be any, of free trade, except such as comes to it from having selected and cut off from protection many industries which were at least as deserving as those which are to survive. In its struggle to put raw materials on the free list, this bill, devised in the main by Southern men, has so stricken the undeveloped regions of this country that the South is more likely than any other part of us to pre-eminently suffer by their efforts. The time was when the West felt toward protection much as the South does now, but with Illinois as the third manufacturing State in the Union, the West beyond the Mississippi is looking forward to the day when the more direct benefits may reach them and develop their resources also. In like manner the wise business men of the South are looking forward to-day, or rather were looking forward last year.

The bill cannot claim any merit as a fulfilment of the platform of the Democratic party, since that platform denounced protection as robbery; and if protection be robbery, then this bill is robbery on a sliding scale. In one instance, at least, the bill involves more unblushing misuse of public funds than was ever charged upon its predecessors, even in those impassioned harangues over the horrors of taxed trace-chains which illuminated my earlier days in Congress.

In the present law there is a provision to pay to sugar planters and producers, mostly in the South, a bounty which amounts to a large sum every year, to continue for fifteen years. That bounty was given every sanction possible. The money to pay it was made part of the permanent appropriation and did not need to be appropriated every year. This was given for a twofold purpose : as a substitute for the protection incidental, and therefore Democratic, which had resulted from a revenue tax from which we desired to free the country, and also as a means of establishing permanently in the South the production of cane sugar, and in the North of beet sugar. That bounty could only be justified on the ground that an industry worth this large expenditure could be established in the country.

The present bill proposes to substitute for this bounty a new bounty beginning at the same figure and diminishing one-eighth every year so as to cease in eight years. On what principle is this to be done? On the principle that the United States is thereby to obtain an industry worth that sum of money? Not at

all. Nobody dreams that in eight years on a sliding scale such an industry can be established or even sustained. Is it on the principle that the United States owes something to a discontinued industry? That would hardly be claimed, for, if it were so, the incomes of the corporations would be highly taxed the next few years to pay for what this bill does in that direction. Can it be justified on the ground of contract in this particular case? If so, then the contract calls for full bounty for fifteen years, not a half-bounty for half the time. The truth is that the sop of thirty-four millions, more or less, thrown to the Louisiana planters is pure gratuity for which no one has even the poor excuse of hoping that some good will come of it to the country giving the money.

To put this item into the bill seems doubly strange when you remember how vocal the air was one time with these men's denunciation of even the idea of bounties. It does really look as if Chairman Wilson was right in calling this a "political bill."

If the bill cannot claim that it carries out the principle of free trade, and cannot, by the wildest stretch of imagination, be deemed the fulfilment of solemn pledges of the party in power, what is its merit? It cannot be that the men who made it will claim for it the advantages of Protection. They could not do it. Too long have they reiterated the charge that "Protection is robbery, depriving people of their property under pretence of taxation." "Can taxation create anything?" they have been asking triumphantly in chorus for long years. If taxation cannot create anything, what are they trying to save by their sanction of reduced robbery? If the consumer has to pay the tax to the manufacturer equal to that added by the tariff to the price of imported goods, what difference is there in principle between that taxation which puts an unjust dollar into the pockets of the robber barons, and that same kind of taxation when it puts an unjust half a dollar into the same pocket to jingle against the dollars of bygone days? Has the United States reached that point of national decrepitude when it must ransom itself by a surrender of one-half of an unjustifiable exaction?

This bill has all the forms of a protection bill. It tries to adjust the duties to the nature of the production and to discriminate between different stages of manufacture. It surrenders all

principle in form, but is likely to be as deadly as could be desired in practice.

Let us see what are likely to be the results. Production will not cease. The plants are here, however reduced in value, and must in all possible cases be utilized. In some cases they cannot be, in others they will be. But the conditions must all be seriously changed. The people of this country are all used to high wages and the distribution of comforts that these wages bring. Let us not dispute whether the tariff or organized labor has caused this. The fact exists. When under this bill—if such a misfortune as its passage is to happen to us—our goods come to the market, they will meet goods which can be sold, duty paid, at a lower price than the cost here, provided our labor receives the same wages as heretofore. How can they be met? Manufacturing is not a happy-go-lucky business. It is a matter of figures. It is so here. It is so over the water, and they are not asleep beyond seas.

A Bradford expert had figured out the effect of the new tariff bill two days before it was even presented to the Ways and Means Committee, and he predicted for Bradford “five years of such prosperity as she has not known since 1872.” Such are the people we have to meet, and we can only meet them by reduction of prices of labor. If, then, we reduce the price of labor, we can at best only hold our own markets; and with the price of labor reduced, what are our markets worth? Just so much less as our wages come down. What makes America so good a market that all the world longs to break into it? The wages and the payments for labor both of brain and muscle. If you reduce such payments can it help still further reacting upon all our products? This question needs no answer. The country at this moment is learning the lesson of the interdependence of industries and the railroad employee discharged because the factory and the mine send no products to market hardly needs to be further taught that a country with one set of industries out of joint can no more rejoice in its remaining resources than a man with a broken leg can be happy over the whole bones in the rest of his body. Lower wages and lower prices may seem simple of adjustment to a man in a closet, but less work because of foreign goods and a market cut in two by reduction of wages may prove impossible of endurance to men who have to live in a practical world.

It would not be suitable in an article like this to specify the probable effects of the bill in its particulars, even if anybody were capable of it. Each community will know before the year is out if it passes. Every heart will soon know its own bitterness. There are some considerations of a general character which ought to be borne in mind. A manufacturing establishment as a producer of wealth is something more than mills and machinery. It is a workshop full of men who have to be organized to work with each other, whose co-operation in all ways is almost as essential as their work. Each man must fit into his place, and the work of each must supplement the work of the other. The shop must be a harmonious whole. This organization is hard to make, is the result of much time and patience and not lightly to be tampered with. Moreover the establishment must not only make its goods, but must sell them. It must have its regular customers, who know and can rely on mutual understanding. A set of customers also is the result of time, patience, and skill. These customers cannot be lightly cast away. Business relations are like open accounts, hard to commence, but easy to continue. If a manufacturing establishment is disabled and can no longer make goods at a profit by reason of the lowering of the tariff, the customers may be held by manufacturing abroad or by purchase of goods made abroad. This last system will be resorted to by those who have ample capital and the disposition and faith to await the change of obnoxious laws. But the organization inside must be lost, and the men who compose it must inevitably suffer. In fact, they are suffering now, and will until this bill is defeated.

Another consideration has got to be faced. A closed manufactory is not like a closed house, where the furniture can be covered, and there is no loss except what may be measured by the rent. A manufactory closed deteriorates beyond all expectation, and that is not the worst of it. It gets behind the times, and in a few years would be worthless. The price of successful manufacturing is ceaseless vigilance. No machinery is too good not to be replaced at short intervals. Men must keep pace with all that others do, and add their quota of inventive power besides. Many a manufactory is saved by the utilization of by-products. People at large do not appreciate the narrow margins of the business, and take no account of bad years, and risks and expendi-

tures to replace machinery gone out of date and to make experiments for the future.

Were it not for these considerations men might perhaps console themselves by looking forward to the speedy repeal of these proposed enactments even if they should be passed, but the system under which we live imposes the barrier of three years at least against such a hope. But who doubts to-day what is the opinion of the people of the United States on this proposed action of the Government? That is shown not alone by the results of the last election and the uniform expression of the whole North; it can be seen in the daily privations of the people, the utter stagnation of business, and in the faces of the Committee of Ways and Means themselves. It will really not be much consolation, that what is our loss seems to be some other nation's gain. If West Virginia coalfields are undeveloped and the State which sent its Democratic governor to remonstrate with full voice and indignant iteration against the action of its Democratic representative should halt in its progress, it will not seem to be compensation that Nova Scotia and some citizens of New England, who have invested capital outside of this country, will reap the benefit. If a flourishing town in New England should cease to quarry lime rock and send its product to market, we should not be satisfied to know that New Brunswick will build another city—and the Dominion will gain what we have lost.

Such joy as is expressed in Nova Scotia over free coal, in New Brunswick over lessened duty on lime, and in Bradford over the revival of its woollen industries at the cost, charges, and expense of our own, may afford satisfaction to those whose hearts have so enlarged that they have become citizens of the world; but those who have only reached that stage of development which causes them to be content with being mere citizens of the United States will still cling to the provincial and Philistine feeling that happy cities this side the Atlantic on our shores interest them more than happy cities on any other shores.

There can hardly be a doubt that the passage of the proposed bill will call back the Republican party to power at the first opportunity, but no Republican, under fear that when the danger is over people will forget how great the danger was, can afford to omit a single effort to save the country from this unfortunate bill.

THOMAS B. REED.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

RECENT ROMANCINGS ON HEAVEN AND HELL.

DURING the past year several important contributions have been made to current literature on the subject of heaven and hell, especially the latter. Perhaps the most remarkable contribution of this kind, and certainly the one to create the most widespread sensation, was written by Prof. St. George Mivart, a distinguished Catholic theologian, and was entitled "Happiness in Hell."

According to the tenets of the older and sterner church there is a hell not only for the wicked who defy God's commandments in this life, but also for others who through no fault of theirs are unable to fulfil certain conditions. Professor Mivart, however, lays down the doctrine that the latter class do enjoy a certain happiness, and that their greatest misery lies in the fact that they can not enjoy the beatific vision. Such souls, he maintains, can be happy, though the highest happiness is not within their reach. This view of the complex question was severely assailed by other Catholic writers, and the heretical mouse was quickly disposed of by the orthodox cats, so that the world is now aware that such is not the doctrine of the Catholic Church.

There has also been contributed to literature recently, by an American woman, a drama which gives a novel idea of hell. It represents a man in a dream talking with several of his departed ancestors. One of these told the man that he was in hell, though there was no such place as heaven or hell in the way in which these terms were commonly understood. This man's hell was a condition of feeling in which he had no interest in anything. He felt no enjoyment, no ambition, no pleasure, no passions, no desires. He could go to heaven, he said, if he liked, but he had no desire. He was not interested in anything he might find there or anywhere else.

This condition is to a certain extent exemplified in club life, in society, and in the general lives of the rich and idle. They have exhausted every source of enjoyment and tapped all fountains of enthusiasm. New schemes have to be constantly provided to stimulate even a little their appetite for pleasure. Hell, according to this writer, is this condition carried to its extremity. It is a condition without hope, feeling, ambition, or desires—one of the most horrible states in which any man or woman could be placed.

These two productions may be taken as types of several others, the writers of which put forward descriptions of hell and talk about the recognition of friends in heaven as if they knew all about it. One of these critics

of the unseen has even ventured to write a paper upon "Social Life in Heaven," from the reading of which we must confess the very title deterred us. What can this writer, or any one else, know of social, *i. e.*, companionable or company, life in heaven? It seems to us that the very suggestion that any one knows a whit about it is dishonest.

Such articles as these, however, invariably provoke considerable discussion because man has always been anxious to pierce beyond the veil which closes over the grave and hides from him his hereafter. Some of the most popular books of the present day have been those which treat, and too often treat mischievously, in poetic and exaggerated language, of the glorious heaven or the terrible hell which awaits the soul. Works of this class have been sold by thousands.

Cloudy contemplations and loose and inaccurate attempts to construe obscure revelations have been spun out page after page, and the reader whose curiosity has been moved to buy such books is sometimes frightened into a madhouse by pictures of torment taken from Dante's gloomy poem, and for which there is no warranty in Scripture. On the other hand, heaven is spoken of by some as if it were reserved only for a special set of persons who agree in a blind worship of their own arbitrary ideal; and it was this pharisaic spirit which made Hood exclaim:

"My spirit swells not with the bigot's leaven;
All on I view with toleration thorough,
And have a horror of regarding heaven
As any priest's or prelate's rotten borough."

In all ages and in most countries man has expected to find in the next life somewhat of a continuation of the joys and pleasures of this. The lower the culture of a people, the more rude is the idea that they have of heaven. Pope has reason in his sarcasm when he tells some rude boor to

"Go, like the Indian; in the better life
Expect thy dog, thy bottle, and thy wife."

And the material heaven of the Mahometan, where pleasant rivers and shining waters await the blessed who shall in wondrous gardens meet with crowds of beautiful houri brides, ever fresh and ever young, is sufficient in the eyes of the philosopher at once to condemn the faith which is propagated by conquest, slaughter, and blood, and rewarded by pleasure and lust. Not much more rational was the poetic idea of heaven which the learned Pagans taught. This was a heaven where impalpable but visible shades met and conversed upon matters of earth. Warrior met warrior, poet met poet, and each talked about his art, his family, and his history. It was a notion surely born of the conceit of man, which presumed that the spirits of the departed debated upon the business of their relations on earth.

From these sad dreams of Tartarus, where sat the judges who could not be corrupted by bribes, and where men's actions pleaded for them or against them, almost all modern notions of the future state of the soul seem to have been taken. For eighteen hundred years we have not been able to shake off the effects of classicism. The stories of the Greek and Latin poets taught in our schools have affected the upper classes even more than the Bible has affected the lower.

It was but natural that poetry should be tinted with the hues emanating from these poetic lights. The human mind is slow, indeed, to emancipate itself from error. In Dante we have the three judges, Chiron, the centaur, Cerberus, the rivers of the classic hell, and other classic accessories, to

which are added the punishment dreamed of by the early monks and priests in a too literal construction and application of Hebrew texts. From the tone of Dante's *Inferno* it would seem that at the mouth of the grave God forgot his mercy and assumed the character of a pitiless and revengeful creator, who stooped to exhaust the ingenuity of a human mind in the invention of never-varying and never-ending torments.

In the debate of the fiends and overthrown angels in Milton's sublime poem, the chief of hell, Satan, is reminded by one of his subordinates that the greatness of God's mind can discover greater torments; while those which they at present endure they may, in the future, grow used to; but in Dante this miserable hope is cut off. As in Venice, with an ingenuity which may be called hellish, prisoners were confined in winter in cells below the level of the water, where the air was damp and cold, and their limbs were racked with agues and with frost, and were removed in summer to beneath the leads of the castle, where the sun baked them, and the brain seemed to boil with the fever heat of the blood—so the imagination of Dante runs riot in the conception of alternate frost and fire, and of a perpetual change which shall insure a perpetual pain. How miserably mean is this conception!—how different, indeed, even from the action of a magnanimous man, and how far removed from the mercies of the Almighty Father, we leave it to our readers to say.

While we lament the sad mistake which has led the human mind to dwell upon these fictitious horrors and the still sadder tendency which results in such contributions to the literature of the future as those of Professor Mivart and his fellows, we may nevertheless reasonably debate the question what the future life may be, on the lines followed by Archdeacon Farrar in his article entitled "Conceptions of a Future Life," which appeared in the March number of the *NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW*, and by the Rev. Reginald Heber Howe in his paper, "An Episcopal View of Heaven," in the October number. As the latter pointed out in his article, by transgressing beyond these limits we enter the region of individual opinion and speculation, to which there is no end. Of these are born the crudest and most grotesque conceptions of the nature of the future life, as various in character as the varieties of the human mind. Every image has been pushed to its utmost and with the fullest literalness of interpretation, and heaven has been conceived of accordingly—a veritable city, with its walls and its gates and its streets, with its trees and its river.

The Christian faith, which is always and in every portion, when closely looked into, found as far above any human policy as heaven is above earth, is wise in not revealing to any of us what heaven is. It may be comforting to some weak souls to dream of a new Heaven as one would of a new estate—a Jerusalem by pleasant waters, without tyrants or judges or enemies to torment without or rogues to break through and steal within. It is so hard to free one's self from earthly ideas that we can pardon the story of Charles Young, the actor, who, before he died, kissed the portrait and the golden lock of hair of his wife whom he had lost fifty years before, and said, "Now I shall see you, my dear Julia." Not to be with God, not to know himself as he himself would be known, not to wonder at the exhaustless power of the All-worker, but again "to see his Julia," was the old man's dream.

Shall we know each other in heaven? The intense desire apparent in the best of minds, of men as well as of women, to resume in heaven the

ties and the society formed on earth, may perhaps be taken as some indication that we shall again know our friends—at least those who are good and true. But it is no proof. It is a foolish and an unlicensed thing to inquire what shall be in heaven. We should remember that we can only properly estimate heaven by generalities and negatives. It is not a place such as we can imagine. If any man tells what it is, that we may be sure it is not. There will be three surprises in heaven—the very greatest at being there ourselves, the second at the absence of those who we thought would be there, and the third at the presence of those who we had condemned and excluded. But beyond that, we may say with Bishop Rust: “It is not for any mortal creature to make a map of that Canaan that lies above; it is, to all of us who live here on the other side of the country, a *terra incognita*.” The contemplation of heaven is, in itself, so sublime that it may tax us to the verge of our imagination. What is beautiful in the perfected earth, what is lovely in all holy love, shall remain to us hereafter. This is all we know. With a full trust in that, we can afford to dispense with the vagaries of ungoverned fancy, and to discard the longings of a distempered sentimentality.

GERTRUDE B. ROLFE.

PROFESSOR TYNDALL AS A MATERIALIST.

IT IS an easy thing to remand Professor Tyndall, without more ado, to the camp of materialists, and thereby attach to his name the opprobrium which falls upon all those who hold that grosser form of materialism which Carlyle characterizes as the “philosophy of mud.” There are materialists and materialists. Professor Tyndall must be carefully distinguished from the spirit-blind devotees of matter, who stoutly insist that the manifold problems of being and destiny find a ready solution in the properties of matter and the law of the conservation of energy. He differs radically at this point from the rank and file of pure materialists. To overlook the difference between them prevents an honest and just estimate of the man, as a scientist and a philosopher. He has already suffered in this regard in many quarters; but now, at the time of his death especially, he merits a fair and tolerant criticism from all, however widely they may differ from him. It is true that Professor Tyndall finds in matter “the promise and potency of every form and quality of life.” Nevertheless, he frankly acknowledges the natural limitations to the materialist’s position, viz., that when one has posited the properties and laws of matter he has only removed the difficulties a step farther back; that the analysis is not ultimate: that there is still the genesis of matter, which must be explained; and that there the problem is left in an unsolved and unsatisfactory state. Concerning the famous dictum of German materialism, *Ohne Phosphor, kein Gedanke* (“without phosphorus there can be no thought”) Professor Tyndall, in his *Scientific Limit of the Imagination*, comments as follows:

“This may or may not be the case, but even if we knew it to be the case the knowledge would not lighten our darkness. On both sides of the zone here assigned to the materialist, he is equally helpless. If you ask him where is this matter, of which we have been discoursing, who or what divided it into molecules, who or what impressed upon them this necessity of running into organic forms, he has no answer.”

He recognizes a mystery which materialism cannot remove, and that,

too, in a way which distinctly separates his philosophy from the "philosophy of mud." In the same frank manner he acknowledges the natural limits of the Darwinian Hypothesis; he recognizes its defects as a final philosophy, and that it too leaves unanswered the many questions concerning God, nature, and human life. In his *Scientific Use of the Imagination* he says:

"Fear not the evolution hypothesis, steady yourselves in its presence upon that faith in the ultimate triumph of truth which was expressed by old Gamaliel when he said: If it be of God ye cannot overthrow it; if it be of man it will come to naught. Under the fierce light of scientific inquiry this hypothesis is sure to be dissipated if it possess not a core of truth. Trust me, its existence as a hypothesis in the mind is quite compatible with the simultaneous existence of all those virtues to which the term Christian has been applied. It does not solve—it does not profess to solve—the ultimate mystery of this universe. It leaves, in fact, that mystery untouched. For granting the nebula and its potential life, the question, Whence came they? would still remain to baffle and bewilder us. At bottom the hypothesis does nothing more than 'transport the conception of life's origin to an indefinitely distant past.'"

At the outermost rim of his scientific investigation, Professor Tyndall acknowledges ever a bourne of mystery beyond. Towards this he looks with interest and with reverence. There is no indifference in his attitude towards the great unknown—and no conceit. You may call the position in reference to the world of the unseen, and its mysteries, as that of an agnostic; but here also his agnosticism must be distinguished from many who thus style their philosophy or rather lack of philosophy. With him, knowledge is either observed fact, or induced law through verified experiments. All else he has been accustomed to regard as lying beyond his ken. This is his habit of life, moving, working, thinking amidst the things seen, felt, heard, or capable of being touched, and weighed and measured. To a just understanding and appreciation of his views, we must apply that law of relativity, which he employed as his favorite mode of interpretation as regards men and theories. It is this: that the

"impression made upon us by any circumstance, or combination of circumstances, depends upon our previous state. Two travellers upon the same peak, the one having ascended to it from the plain, the other having descended to it from a higher elevation, will be differently affected by the scene around them. To the one, nature is expanding, to the other it is contracting, and feelings are sure to differ which have such different antecedent states."

Professor Tyndall, therefore, educated in the school of the senses, approaches the things which lie beyond the sphere of sense in an extremely cautious manner. He here hesitates to make any affirmation whatsoever. He is one who has but one desire—to know the truth. He has but one fear—to believe a lie. He is so conscientiously sincere that he will speak only concerning the things which lie wholly within his sphere, the world of observation and experiment. His temperament and habit of life naturally precluded him from expressing his views upon any subject, concerning which there is not absolute certitude in his own mind. While we find, therefore, that his statements regarding the supersensuous are at a minimum concerning their extent, still they carry with them, few though they be, a maximum force. His agnosticism does not deny the possibility that there may be an explanation of the vexed questions of the life which now is, and that which is to come. He has no answer, but he is far from asserting that

an answer is impossible. He has a mind open on all sides. He acknowledges the part which the emotional nature of man has played in the history of his development; and in this emotional nature the religious feelings and aspirations hold a prominent place. In his "Inaugural Address" at the British Association he says:

"There are such things woven into the texture of man as the feeling of awe, reverence and wonder, and the love of the beautiful, physical and moral, in nature, poetry, and art. There is also that deep-set feeling which since the earliest dawn of history, and probably for ages prior to all history, incorporated itself in the religions of the world. . . . To yield the religious sentiment reasonable satisfaction is the problem of problems at this present hour."

This is not the language of materialism. It has an outlook towards spiritual verities. We would of course be better satisfied if Professor Tyndall did not insist that religion has only an emotional side, we believing that all enduring sentiment must have an intellectual basis. Nevertheless, we are in accord with him as far as he goes, and he goes far enough, at least, to separate himself completely from the disciples of crude materialism. He does not often grant us glimpses of his own emotional nature. But it forms no small part of the undercurrent of his being which Matthew Arnold so felicitously characterized as the "buried life" of man. It was when far removed from the haunts of men, and drawn nearer to the great heart of nature, that his own heart would leap in sympathetic appreciation of the widespread wonders and beauty about him. In his *Hours of Exercise in the Alps*, his love of nature, again and again, breaks into apostrophe. His admiration is akin to reverence. His communion with nature is not that of a materialist; it is that of the humble child of nature. He says, in his *Scientific Use of the Imagination*:

"The scientists have as little fellowship with the atheist who says there is no God as with the theist who professes to know the mind of God. 'Two things,' said Emanuel Kant, 'fill me with awe: the starry heavens and the sense of moral responsibility in man.' And in his hours of health and strength and sanity, when the stroke of action has ceased, and the pause of reflection has set in, the scientific investigator finds himself overshadowed by the same awe. Breaking contact with the hampering details of earth, it associates him with a power which gives fullness and tone to his existence, but which he can neither analyze nor comprehend."

Here is a spirit not only reverential, but worshipful; and we cannot suppress the conviction which irresistibly forces itself upon our thought, that in the depths of his soul were many treasures of faith and hope never disclosed to eye of man. Although his creed is short, it at least manifests certain intimations of immortality in the heart of one whose life was solely devoted to material things.

At the close of his *Inaugural Address*, he shows forth his many-sided nature in a passage which breathes the spirit of sincerity, and of tolerance, and of reverence withal.

"I would set forth equally the inexorable advance of man's understanding in the path of knowledge, and the unquenchable claims of his emotional nature which the understanding can never satisfy. The world embraces not only a Newton, but a Shakespeare—not only a Boyle, but a Raphael—not only a Kant, but a Beethoven—not only a Darwin, but a Carlyle. Not in each of these, but in all, is human nature whole. They are not opposed, but supplementary—not mutually exclusive, but reconcilable. And, if still unsatisfied, the human mind, with the yearning of a pilgrim for his distant home, will return to the mystery from which it has emerged, seeking so to fashion it as to give unity to thought and faith; so long as this is done

not only without intolerance and bigotry of any kind, but with the enlightened recognition that ultimate fixity of conception is here unattainable, and that each succeeding age must be held free to fashion the mystery in accordance with its own needs; then, in opposition to all the restrictions of materialism, I would affirm this to be a field for the noblest exercise of what, in contrast with the knowing faculties, may be called the creative faculties of man. Here, however, I must quit a theme too great for me to handle, but which will be handled by the loftiest minds ages after you and I, like streaks of morning cloud, shall have melted into the infinite azure of the Past."

Here are evidences not only of a philosophy rising above the dead level of materialism, but also of the fire of hope and faith which burns bright in the heart of every man.

JOHN GRIER HIBBEN.

STREET BEGGING AS A FINE ART.

THE recent enormous and even alarming increase in the number of beggars in New York is accounted for by the police authorities on the ground that a large number of professional mendicants are drawn to New York from all parts of the country at this season of the year by the well-founded belief that means are so ample there and that charity is so free.

This horde of beggars, which seems to have been suddenly let loose upon the streets of the metropolis, consists for the most part of surly-looking men, with unkempt beards, bleared eyes, and threatening manners. Sturdy and impudent, they are to be found on the streets both uptown and downtown from early in the evening until daylight. In the neighborhood of the big hotels they are especially prolific. Fifth avenue from Fourteenth street to Forty-second street seems to be their favorite haunt. Here they lie in wait in the doorways, from whence they suddenly dart out at the passer-by, fall in with his gait and insist upon alms.

They began about a month ago by frightening women into giving them money, but lately they have been begging from men. When refused, they are usually content to say something insulting, although in some cases they almost use threats to extort money. The stabbing of a gentleman recently at his doorway on Fifth avenue by one of these beggars to whom he had refused alms is only an instance of a trifle more violence on the part of the mendicant than is exhibited by other members of the tribe which now infests the streets of New York.

In the old days, when every town sought to take care of its own folk, the beggar who came from a distance and was not a handicraftsman was put in the stocks or was roughly brought before the magistrates and carefully whipped before being started on his way towards elsewhere. This was all very pleasant and patriarchal. It presupposed that every man could and would take care of his own; that there was something to do for every one who would work; and that, in fact, no one ought to be simply a beggar or vagabond.

The professional beggar is not a modern innovation, by any means. Readers of the *Spectator* will recall "Scarecrow," the famous London beggar who, having disabled himself in his right leg, asked alms all day in order to get a warm supper at night. According to John Timbs, the "Rufflers," to whom we often find mention in the literature of the seventeenth century, were troops of idle vagrants who infested Lincoln's Inn Fields. They assumed the characters of maimed soldiers who had suffered

in the great rebellion, and found a ready prey in the people of fashion and quality who drove by. Indeed, it is made clear by contemporary allusion in comedies that this square was the regular haunt of bogus cripples who lived by mendicancy, which they carried on in the most barefaced and even intimidating manner.

It is related that George IV., when Prince of Wales, once attended a beggars' carnival in London, *incognito*. He had not been there long when the chairman, addressing the company and pointing to the Prince, said, "I call upon that ere gemman with a shilt for a song." The Prince, as well as he could, was excused upon a frierd who accompanied him promising to sing instead, which the latter did amid great applause. The health of the Prince and his friend having been drunk, and duly responded to, they departed in order to afford the company an opportunity to fix their different routes for the ensuing day's business; for at that time the professional beggars of London used to have a general meeting several times during the year at which they were divided into companies, each company having its particular walk. In those days their earnings varied much, some getting as much as five shillings a day. Most of the professional beggars in London to-day—and their name is legion—emanate from two or three common lodging-houses. The most populous of these, which is known as "The Dispensary," supports an individual known as a "scriver," who earns a living by manufacturing the pathetic signboards which the sham cripples and bogus blind men carry round their necks. In Paris, as is well known, the professional beggars hold regular weekly meetings at which the routes to be followed by the members of the guild are mapped out by a standing committee. They have an organ of their own, called the *Journal des Mendicants*, which appears twice a week. From a recent issue the following curious advertisement is taken: "Wanted—To engage a cripple for a seaside resort. Good references and a small deposit required." This queer announcement is explained by the fact that the proprietors of hotels and boarding-houses at fashionable French watering-places assume that visitors would be disposed to give alms if an opportunity were afforded them; and as they cannot very well do the begging themselves, they engage professional beggars to whom they grant permission to solicit alms on their premises, and the beggars in return pay them one-half of their daily receipts.

New Yorkers undoubtedly suffer more from the tribe of beggars than the residents of any other city in this country. The professional beggar makes New York his happy hunting-ground, and dresses for his character like any other actor. "He is a Lazarus by day," says a writer, "but at night he puts off his rags and fares sumptuously—then he is Dives. He is an artist, and his art is lying." In the poorer quarters of the city on a Saturday night, when the poor man and his hard-working wife have received their pittance the professional beggar is sure to be on hand, with his detestable whine, his lies, his rags, his professional face, ready to coax the money from these poor people, and to get *in one night* from the charitable more money than the industrious man has got from a whole week's work.

Nor is the occupation very unpleasant. Inured to the open air, beggars are much healthier than the pent-up factory hand or shop-girl. Their "looped and windowed raggedness" is half sham; when it is not so, use has made it pleasant, and they are ragged from choice. Shoeless they are, or their shoes have holes, as ours ought to have—some of the advanced of us declaring that shoes as a whole are a mistake. They have little care or

anxiety, except the fun of dodging the policeman. They have little pride, and therefore can consort with more open and violent thieves. Actually they are thieves themselves, for they take money for work which they have not done. Moreover, they shamelessly impose upon those who really pity and befriend them.

The manner in which they impose upon people we all know; to what extent they do so may be guessed. A well-known clergyman recently set his wits to work to relieve distress, but, being a wise Christian, he made inquiries *before* he gave relief. Of two hundred beggars, only two—one per cent.—gave true addresses, and of those two, one succeeded in cheating him.

Professional beggars pass under various aliases. They change their addresses to avoid detection. They travel from city to city. The Charity Organization Society has among its records the history of one old man who collected something like eighteen thousand dollars by years of industrious begging. His wife and children were well-to-do, but although very much ashamed of the business, they were unable to make him desist. He had done the thing so long that he could not be persuaded to give it up.

The ruses resorted to by some of these professional beggars are not without interest. There is, for instance, the lamplighter, whose pitiful story has unloosened the purse-strings of so many generous but unwary people. His story is that he used to light lamps on your street. He remembers you very well; but perhaps you have forgotten him. But knowing your face so well, he ventures to ask for a small loan. At this point he begins to tell you a most beautiful and pathetic story.

Then there was the young man who dropped the crust of bread upon the sidewalk, then covertly picked it up, glanced around to see that he was not observed and hurried away. A new character has recently appeared upon the streets in the shape of a young woman of lady-like appearance, handsomely dressed, who has accidentally lost her pocketbook and wants just enough to pay her carfare home. A lady answering to this description was seen by several different people in different parts of the city during the past few weeks.

A few years ago there appeared in New York, and afterwards in various other cities, a mild old lady with a handsome daughter. Both of them were very refined in appearance and clearly in a great and sudden distress, of which they were very reluctant to speak. The story they told of the bereavement and sudden misfortune which had come to them was so pathetic that it kept them in funds for a number of years, until the fraud was finally discovered and their real history published. There have been no reports of this couple for many months now. They are probably working in some other city. But as these professional beggars make their appearance periodically, it is pretty near time for them to show up again. And then these people invariably return to New York sooner or later. It seems to have a sort of fascination for them.

Experience teaches that a man who will make a business of begging will steal. Professional beggars must therefore be hunted down and prosecuted just the same as any other sort of criminals. As the law now stands, persons who beg can be punished, and rightly so, we think, for that offence. One thing is certain, that they ought to be either relieved or punished. This being conceded, it follows that at least ninety-five out of every hundred habitual beggars are professional rogues, idle persons brought up to beggary, who cheat the good, prevent relief from coming

into the hands of the needy, live a miserable, vicious, and wicked life, rob society of whatever each of them owes to God's world in return for the benefits that he gets, trouble society with infinite evils, and should be most severely punished, and by force exterminated—that is to say, converted into working members of the community by being set to some employment more or less profitable.

The relation of the vagrant to the criminal class is of the closest character; it is hard to say where the one begins and the other ends. Every vagabond is an idle fellow, quite ready to turn his hand to the easiest way of getting money. When he cannot cheat, he steals; if stealing is beyond his reach, he begs in a whining tone. That in New York he subsists almost wholly by begging is owing to the ceaseless good-nature of the public. Whatever New York may be to the poor, honest, and industrious workingman, it is a land flowing with milk and honey to the idle. The popular myth that our streets are paved with gold is practically realized by this class; and what a base class it is! The more we think of the enormity of the swindle they are engaged in, the more indignant we become. It does not hurt the rich so much as the poor man. The giver is swindled out of his money, and God will reward him—indeed, his conscience already rewards him—for his deed, if done in true charity; but the poor, modest, starving man, who is dying of hunger in some miserable abode, *that* is the man who is robbed by the professional beggar.

"All of these people," says a report, "are more or less debased; their intellectual faculties are of the lowest order; their moral sense is stifled or inactive through suspicion or dishonesty." Laziness, the mother of all evil, is at the bottom of this criminal cupidity, but the immediate parent of all is indiscriminate charity. There is no nobility so great as that exhibited by him who beneficently labors for the good of all; but so-called charity has thrown all natural feelings on such matters quite out of gear. Mendicancy, attracted by the feelings of greed of getting some of the large prizes in our institutions and charities, is raised into a scientific profession; and what is easily obtained is, according to a universal law, as lightly spent. People get by beggary, and spend in drunkenness.

It is not necessary for individuals to take matters into their own hands. Indeed, they should not, for if they do they will increase the difficulties of everybody who tries to relieve suffering in a rational way. Giving on the street will increase the number of mendicants of the worst class, and people must not be deceived by the piteous realism of the plea, for eloquence and plausibility are a sure sign of the artist and the undeserving specialist.

The remedy lies in systematic charity, instead of the practice pursued by the careless giver. The criminal and vagabond class has been cultivated and fostered by foolish philanthropists and by an over-generous and soft-hearted public. It is useless for work, for almost anything; it is utterly demoralized. It is hard to say whether its men or women are worst. At any rate they are not to be pitied, but to be hated until the crime has gone out of them; not to be fostered, but to be cut up. Leniency with them is a fault; easy good nature is a crime, for mistaken kindness to them means cruelty of the worst kind towards the industrious and deserving poor with whom they are brought into contact, and whose progeny they too often ruin and corrupt.

K. K. BENTWICK.